

A D V E N T S H I E L D

AND

R E V I E W.

EDITED BY

J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS. & A. HALE.

VOL. I.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,

No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.

1844—5.

~~~~~  
**DOW AND JACKSON....PRINTERS.**

# CONTENTS.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | PAGE.                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>ART. I.—THE MILLERITE'S CONFESSION AND ADVENTIST'S APOLOGY,</b>                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>5</b>               |
| Apology,                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 9                      |
| What is Written,                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 17                     |
| Great Swelling Words of Vanity,                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 25                     |
| The Devil has his Counterfeit Millennium,                                                                                                                                                                                          | 33                     |
| <br><b>" II.—THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ADVENTISM,</b>                                                                                                                                                                               | <br><b>46</b>          |
| Of Adventism,                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 49                     |
| Publication of Mr. Miller's Lectures,                                                                                                                                                                                              | 53                     |
| Mr. Miller in Massachusetts—Publications, etc.,                                                                                                                                                                                    | 57                     |
| United Effort,                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 60                     |
| Mr. Dowling's Book,                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 60                     |
| Adventism established in New York city,                                                                                                                                                                                            | 67                     |
| Camp-meeting Era,                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 68                     |
| The Great Tent,                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 69                     |
| The "Midnight Cry" Commenced,                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 70                     |
| The Crisis—its Effect,                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 73                     |
| Mr. Miller's Visit to Washington,                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 79                     |
| The Termination of the Prophetic Periods,                                                                                                                                                                                          | 79                     |
| Fundamental Principles on which the Second Advent Cause is based,                                                                                                                                                                  | 80                     |
| Modes of Opposition,                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 83                     |
| Advent Books,                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 87                     |
| What Adventism has accomplished,                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 89                     |
| The Cause in Great Britain,                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 91                     |
| <br><b>" III.—PROPHETIC CHRONOLOGY,</b>                                                                                                                                                                                            | <br><b>93</b>          |
| The Two Thousand Three Hundred Days,                                                                                                                                                                                               | 100                    |
| When did the Commandment go forth,                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 103                    |
| What Months of the Jewish Calendar fall within the seventh (or<br>any other year) of Artaxerxes,                                                                                                                                   | 107                    |
| <br><b>" IV.—THE DOWNFALL OF GREAT BABYLON,</b>                                                                                                                                                                                    | <br><b>112</b>         |
| What is Babylon,                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 112                    |
| What is the Fall of Babylon,                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 116                    |
| <br><b>" V.—OUR POSITION AS TO TIME—THE PROPHETIC PERIODS,</b>                                                                                                                                                                     | <br><b>121</b>         |
| <br><b>" VI.—THE REFORMATION OF LUTHER—ITS SIMILARITY TO THE<br/>        PRESENT TIMES,</b>                                                                                                                                        | <br><b>145</b>         |
| <br><b>" VII.—SATAN'S LAST PAROCHIAL CALLS,</b>                                                                                                                                                                                    | <br><b>163</b>         |
| <br><b>" VIII.—VERSION OF DANIEL II., VII., VIII., IX.,</b>                                                                                                                                                                        | <br><b>167</b>         |
| <br><b>" IX.—PROPHETIC USE OF A DAY FOR A YEAR—THE NEW<br/>        THEORY OF INTERPRETATION,</b>                                                                                                                                   | <br><b>181</b>         |
| <br><b>" X.—EXCLUSIVENESS,</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <br><b>189</b>         |
| <br><b>" XI.—THE BEREAVED TO THE DEPARTED,</b>                                                                                                                                                                                     | <br><b>202</b>         |
| <br><b>" XII.—REPLY TO PROFESSOR BUSH'S "VALLEY OF VISION: Or the<br/>        Dry Bones of Israel Revived. An attempted proof<br/>        (from Eze. xxxvii. 1—14) of the Restoration and<br/>        Conversion of the Jews,"</b> | <br><br><br><b>204</b> |
| The whole House of Israel,                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 207                    |
| The Land of Israel,                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 210                    |
| The Vision,                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 212                    |
| Explanation,                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 213                    |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | PAGE. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| <b>ART. XIII.—THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION—</b><br>demonstrated from the Prophetic Destiny, Modern<br>History, Present Attitude, Resources and Intentions<br>of Popery,—continued to Volume 2, - - -                                                | 223   |
| Popery a Subject of Prophecy, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 223   |
| Character of Popery, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 226   |
| Its Fanaticism, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 230   |
| Its Avarice, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 232   |
| Papal Ignorance, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 233   |
| Her Philosophers, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 242   |
| Portrait of Popery, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 246   |
| Prophetic Destiny of Popery, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 248   |
| The Papacy is Anti-Christ, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 252   |
| <br><b>" XIV.—THE SEVENTH MONTH MOVEMENT—ITS HISTORY—ITS</b><br>Results—Defects in the Argument—Our Position, - - -                                                                                                                                                | 267   |
| Its Fruits, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 271   |
| The Time in our year of the true Seventh Month, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 272   |
| The Defects of the Chronological Argument, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 280   |
| The True Chronological Argument which is contained in the Types, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                             | 281   |
| The Termination of the Prophetic Periods. - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 282   |
| <br><b>" XV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION VINDICATED. A</b><br>Review of "Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the<br>Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scrip-<br>turally considered, by George Bush, Professor of<br>Hebrew, New York City University," - - - | 289   |
| "The Knowledge of Revelation is Progressive," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 290   |
| "The Argument from Reason," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 293   |
| New combination of particles, composing the dead body, between<br>Death and the Resurrection, - - -                                                                                                                                                                | 301   |
| Relation between the body that dies and the body that is raised, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                             | 306   |
| "Distinction of Personal and Bodily Identity," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 314   |
| "The true Body of the Resurrection, as inferred by Reason," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 316   |
| "The Scriptural Argument," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 322   |
| "The Old Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 324   |
| "Examination of Particular Passages," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 325   |
| The New Testament Doctrine of the Resurrection, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 334   |
| "The Resurrection of Christ," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 336   |
| "Examination of particular passages" in the New Testament, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 342   |
| "The Resurrection viewed in connection with the Judgment," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 369   |
| "The first Resurrection and the Judgment of the Dead," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 377   |
| "The Times of the Restitution of all things," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 387   |
| "Christ's Delivering up the Kingdom," - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 393   |
| The Second Advent, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | 414   |
| <br><b>" XVI.—THE CONFLAGRATION OF THE HEAVENS AND EARTH.</b><br>A Review of "The Millennium and New Jerusa-<br>lem, by George Bush," - - -                                                                                                                        | 423   |
| The Prophecy of Ezekiel, xl—xlviii. - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 430   |
| The Regeneration of the Earth by Fire, - - -                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 432   |

#### NOTICES OF PUBLICATIONS.

|                                                                                                                                |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Dr. Chase's "Remarks on the Book of Daniel," - - -                                                                             | 126 |
| "Questions on the Book of Daniel," - - -                                                                                       | 226 |
| "The Advent Message to the Daughters of Zion, No. 2," - - -                                                                    | 287 |
| "Supplement to the Advent Herald," - - -                                                                                       | 287 |
| "Anastasis, or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body,<br>Rationally and Scripturally considered,—by George Bush," - - - | 287 |
| "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Great Image," by G. Bush, - - -                                                                 | 288 |



*Harvard College July*  
*No. 161*     *bind the covers*

THE  
ADVENT SHIELD,  
AND  
REVIEW.

~~~~~  
MAY, 1844.

VOLUME I.—NUMBER 1.
~~~~~

Boston :  
PUBLISHED BY J. V. HIMES,  
No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.



THE  
ADVENT SHIELD

AND

REVIEW.

*The proper title-page for the volume  
immediately precedes the last number*

---

EDITED BY  
J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS, & A. HALE.

---

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY JOSHUA V. HIMES,  
No. 14 Devonshire Street,  
1844.

## CONTENTS.

|                                                                                   |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ART. I.—THE MILLERITE'S CONFESSION AND ADVENTIST'S APOLOGY,                       | 5   |
| “ II.—THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ADVENTISM, . . . . .                               | 46  |
| “ III.—PROPHETIC CHRONOLOGY, . . . . .                                            | 93  |
| “ IV.—THE DOWNFALL OF GREAT BABYLON, . . . . .                                    | 112 |
| “ V.—OUR POSITION, AS TO TIME, PROPHETIC PERIODS, AND<br>FUTURE LABORS, . . . . . | 121 |
| “ VI.—THE ADVENT,—(AN EXTRACT,) . . . . .                                         | 125 |
| REVIEW OF PROF. CHASE'S REMARKS ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL, .                          | 126 |

---

ERRATA.—We find, on a critical examination of the articles contained in this work, that there are several typographical errors. Some of these are not very important, while others materially affect the sense, which are as follows:—

Page 9, (in the note) for “Kirby,” read *Faber*.

“ 20, 13th line from the bottom, the clause, “by a new title, viz. Revelation,” the last word should read in the *plural*, “Revelations.”

“ 36, 11th line from top, for “*ignus fatui*,” read *ignes fatui*.

“ 38, 13th “ “ “ for “*was invested*,” read, *are invested*.

“ “ 4th “ “ bottom for a *happy* delusion, read an *unhappy* delusion.

“ 112 17th “ “ top, “*secures*,” read *deserves*.

“ 114, 13th “ “ “ for “*anti-type*,” read, *great type*.

## P R E F A C E.

---

THE design of this publication is of a three-fold character. *First*, to defend ourselves as believers in the Advent *at hand*. *Second*, to exhibit the unscriptural and absurd position of our opponents; and, *Third*, to furnish the truth for those who are convinced that the prevailing interpretations of prophecy are unauthorized by the word of God, and are desirous to find the true and the right way.

The defence of our position is comparatively an easy work. Never were soldiers better armed for the warfare to which they were called, than the Adventists are from the great armory, the word of God. He who is prepared to use the armor is sure of the victory.

Nor is it difficult to show the unscriptural character of the popular views of prophecy. And, in a Bible-reading community, these views only need to be compared, in a proper and clear manner, with the Bible, to have all who bow to its authority as above the authority of men, however great they may be esteemed, turn away from them with a full conviction that they *cannot be the truth*.

Our duty, therefore, must be poorly performed if we do not go farther, and assist those on to the sure foundation who are brought to see that there is nothing of the kind where they have stood.

It is in this department of our work that we meet our greatest responsibilities, and perform our most satisfactory labors. No responsibilities, indeed, can be of a more sublime and awful character than those under which the Adventists are laid. Viewing them as we stand related to God simply, we believe he has assigned us the last mission of a special character that will be committed to men in their probationary state. Thus it appears to be brought to view in the word of God,—“*And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, THE BRIDEGROOM COMETH, go ye out to meet him!*” The results of that cry will either admit us to, or reject us from, the marriage supper of the Lamb.

Viewing our responsibilities as we stand related to our fellow-men, they are scarcely less affecting. However our brethren and the public may regard us, we have by no means lost our sympathy for them, or our interest in their hopes and arrangements. They complain of us for disturbing them, and they have a right to complain unless we may be justified in the course we pursue. No man has a right to break up or disturb existing views and plans, unless he can replace them with something better.

Who be to the man who has done, or may do that work, in his own name, or for his own sake, or with any other than a clear warrant from the written word of God! To that we appeal, and to *nothing else*. Whatever that does not condemn, should be permitted to stand unmolested; whatever is at variance with it, must fall.

That the promulgation of the Advent doctrine has had the effect to shake the confidence of the church in, and weaken her attachment for, the great plans and theories which look to an unknown period of prosperity in the future, without the personal presence of Christ—the resurrection of the righteous—the punishment of the wicked and the renovation of the physical world,—is too evident to be the subject of a doubt. It is charged upon us by our opponents, and it is every where apparent.

This result has been produced in two ways. 1. The believers in the Advent doctrine, in many cases, have been silenced or driven away from the communions with which they have been associated, and this has made no trifling reduction of the vitality of their membership. 2. The novel interpretations of the word of God, which have been presented in order to oppose the Advent doctrine, have destroyed, in no small degree, the great Bible motives to Christian zeal. But should we be blamed for this? We have appealed "to the word and the testimony" for authority, and those who have complained of us have failed to show, by the same authority, that we were in the fault. Let the blame fall *where it belongs!*

Nor have we failed (to the praise of God be it spoken,) to furnish those who have been brought under the influence of the Advent doctrine something *better* than that which has been given up:—"better promises," to be realized in the "better country," after the "better resurrection," under the full development of the immortal provisions and arrangements of the "better covenant." And no sincere believer in the Bible will deny, that its first great principle requires that all the affairs of this world should be arranged with a view to the future, restored and never ending world. "*Here we have no CONTINUING city, but we seek one to come.*" God spares, and sustains, and blesses this world, only with a view to results that are to be realized in "*the world to come,*" and the great object of man should be to secure a portion there. If this is the occasion of disturbance, let those who complain prepare to answer for it to their God!

We have only to add, that those who have embraced the Advent faith are more than ever satisfied, with a very few if any exceptions, with the position they have taken, and that it cannot be overthrown.

We have not room to speak particularly of the *contents* of this number. They will be read, we doubt not, with deep interest. If any of our readers should suppose that the works of our opponents, referred to, are treated with undue severity, we have only to say, Read the works, compare them with the word of God, then read what we have said, and they will not complain of severity.

# THE ADVENT SHIELD.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### *The Millerite's Confession, and Adventist's Apology.*

ALTHOUGH every man has a right to differ in opinion from his fellow-man, as to any authority which one may possess over another in the case, still, Christian obligation and courtesy make it very proper, both to ask and to grant a reason for our differences, whenever they involve questions of acknowledged importance.

To Christians, and, indeed, to all men, we have ever been, and hope we ever may be, ready to make our apology in all such cases.

The importance of the question which our position involves is already made apparent, both by its prominence in the word of God, and the public interest it has called forth, so that we need not spend a moment to show the propriety of the step we are about to take. Indeed, a step of this kind has been very generally expected of us; and not a few have demanded it in a very peremptory form.

The mistakes which have been made upon the prophecies are, alas! but too evident; and whenever they are pointed out, it becomes *the mistaken* to make a full and frank confession. And the mistakes of the "Millerites" are so notorious, that we wish, as one of the number at least, to give them our earliest attention; and *if* our opponents should become sensible of any mistakes on their part, there can be no doubt of an acknowledgment, as soon, most certainly, as it may be extorted by policy or necessity.

But we come directly to "the head and front of our offending."

We confess, then, that 'Mr. Miller has published to the world, as one of his "principles" of "faith in this matter," "that Jesus Christ will come again to this earth, cleanse, purify and take possession of the same with all his saints, *some time* between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844."

We confess that "March 21, 1844" is now in the past.

We confess that Mr. Miller fixed upon the very *earliest* time in which the Jewish year could be supposed to terminate; and that we highly approve his wisdom in taking so *safe* ground, as it might have been fatal to many, had he named a time that would have been *too late*! For how many a fatal shipwreck has resulted from the presumption that land was far distant, when the unfortunate mariner was "*right aboard*" of it!

We confess, that, so far as "the *time*" is concerned, in that particular, we are no longer "Millerites."

We confess that we have no doubt of the old protestant, primitive and apostolic interpretation of the prophecies, which we have adopted, both in respect to time and events. And we fully believe that the Lord will come, and that man's probationary state will end at the termination of the prophetic periods so familiar to our readers; and we are satisfied that their termination cannot be far distant—no farther than man's reckoning may vary from the true reckoning.

We confess that, notwithstanding the mistakes we have made, considering we are naturally so much like our opponents, and that we have been so long under some of their erroneous views, and considering the treatment we have received from them; we are surprised that our mistakes, (which we humbly pray may be forgiven by God and men) have been so very few.

We confess that we have been most awfully mistaken in supposing there was a general acquaintance with the prophetic scriptures and with the old standard writers on the prophecies, among the ministry of the land, and that we have been surprised and painfully disappointed to find that little more is known by many of them, of the prophecies, than if they were no part of the Bible, and that there are too many cases of entire ignorance of *any* of the old standard writers; having never become familiar with them in their course of study, so called, and their libraries and centre ta-



bles—though well stored with “Shakespeare,” “Dickens,” the popular “Magazines” and embellished “Annuals”—being entirely destitute of the invaluable works of these learned, able and impartial writers.

We confess that we have felt mortified beyond expression at the utter want of *consistency and good sense* manifested by our brethren of the pulpit and press, in crying out against Mr. Miller—who is looking for *all* the great events for which the patriarchs and prophets, and apostles, and martyrs, and reformers have looked, as brought to view in the promises, and prophecies of the word of God—calling him a “*monomaniac*,” while at the same time they applaud the “Hints” and “Remarks” and “Replies” of his opposers—which hardly allow that the clearest views, contained in the prophets, of the coming of Christ, the resurrection, the judgment and the end of the world, refer to anything but events in the history and times of Antiochus—as characterised by “ripe scholarship,” “critical acumen,” “theological erudition,” &c. &c.

We confess that we have been surprised that a variation of a few days, in a calculation comprehending a long period of years, from the exact time named by Mr. Miller, in expressing his “*faith* in this matter,” should subject him to the charge of being “a false teacher,” an “impostor,” &c., while those who assert that the same periods have “*indisputably*” been “*fulfilled*,” and have failed, by a *hundred fold greater variation*, to show the truth of their application of the prophecies, are greeted as devout and true expounders of the word of God!

We confess that we have made a wrong estimate of the work we should have to do;—for we could not believe that our brethren would reject the “long established” interpretation of the word of God, upon the doctrine and hope of the church, in reference to the second coming of Christ, the resurrection and judgment, without an argument or shadow of a reason than that they now have an unpopular association; while we now are well assured, should time permit, that it must devolve upon us to fight over the battle of the apostles against a proud and sneering semi-pagan philosophy, and that of the reformers, and “*the evangelical*” of modern times against the senseless and impious vagaries of a baptized infidelity.

We confess that we see the most startling evidence that the expectations, the prayers and the offerings of the church,

which have gathered around her theological institutions, very much as Sarah gave Hagar to her "lord," in ignorant contempt of the plan and purpose of Heaven in the case, have already yielded a progeny as odious as Hagar's Ishmael in the eyes of her mistress. Numbers of our young men, the subjects of earnest prayer and ardent hope, who were once devout Christians, by the anti-scriptural and anti-evangelical sentiments received from their theological masters, have become the agents in dispensing the poison of the "serpent" for the "bread" of life. And while their education has poisoned or destroyed their own piety, and prepared them only for a more splendid wreck, what is worse than that, "many follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth is evil spoken of." The blind lead the blind, and both must fall into the pit.

We confess that we have been "slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken," particularly of the "false teachers" who should be "among the people," and sustain the same relation to those who are "mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets," that the "false prophets" of old sustained to the "holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"—false teachers, who, "through covetousness with feigned words shall make merchandize of" the church, and "speak great swelling words of vanity to allure through the lusts of the flesh, and much wantonness, those who were clear, escaped from them that live in error," who should question "the promise of the Lord's coming," and "wrest the scriptures to their own destruction." We have been slow of heart to believe that these could be among our reputed brethren, though not a few of them have demonstrated that this is their true character; and God's word declares that their "judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not."

Finally, we confess that since none of our great and wise and learned adversaries, as they are generally esteemed, have been able to show from the word of God that we are wrong; or by the impartial testimony of history, that we have departed from the ancient and protestant interpretation of the prophecies, as to the prophetic periods, or the events to which they have been applied; but, on the contrary, have uniformly confessed, in the most unequivocal terms, that all

antiquity is in our favor, \* and since we cannot change our position till a more excellent way is pointed out to us ; we declare to the world, before God, that it is our duty to hold fast our position, trusting in God and his truth to sustain us until our expected release shall come.

For taking this position, which, in the estimation of many, will appear so unrighteous and unreasonable, we shall of course be required to make an

#### APOLOGY.

That apology shall be granted. We must beg a little indulgence, however, for being somewhat precise in specifying those for whom it is particularly intended, for there are some who may read this article, from whom an apology would be as proper, on every account, as from us.

It is not, then, designed for *the sects*, as such. We regard them as occupying a position, in reference to the promise of God and its believers in this case, similar to that of the Egyptians of old, in reference to the deliverance of the people of God by the hand of Moses, according to his promise ; or to that of the Jews in reference to our Lord and his disciples. Not that we have any objection to their existence as sects or organizations, in themselves considered. Their *existence* is not the evil. Indeed, we can hardly think of any material modifications of them, which we suppose to be necessary.

\* Professor Bush says : " Nay, I am even ready to go so far as to say, that I do not conceive your errors on the subject of chronology to be at all of a serious nature, or in fact to be *very* wide of the truth. In taking a *day* as the prophetic term for a *year*, I believe you are sustained by the soundest exegesis, as well as fortified by the high names of Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Kirby, Scott, Keith, and a host of others who have long since come to *substantially* your conclusions on this head. They all agree that the leading periods mentioned by Daniel and John, do actually expire *about this age of the world*, and it would be a strange logic that would convict you of heresy for holding in effect the same views which stand forth so prominent in the notices of these eminent divines."—*Letter to Mr. Miller, Second Advent Lib.* No. 44, p. 6.

Professor Chase speaks as follows :—" We need not wonder that the minds of many have, within a few years, been greatly agitated by an expectation of the speedy fulfilment of certain predictions in the Book of Daniel. The way for this was prepared by some of our standard English writers on the Prophecies, men of former ages, venerated for their piety and their erudition."—*Remarks on Dan. Preface*, p. 5.

Professor Stuart more than admits the same, (Hints pp. 8, 38,) though he seems to be out of all patience with Mede and other " interpreters," particularly of the " English and American school," whose " piety and erudition" are to him of no sort of consequence. The events to which they applied the prophecies, " are things which have no specified ground or basis in the Book of Daniel or John," p. 141. Thus one sweep of his modest and magical wand consigns them to oblivion. Others might be quoted to the same effect.

Their treatment of the truth of God, and its believers, is the sin with which we charge them, and of which we complain: though we gladly except from this charge, many individual members, and a number of individual churches, in most of the sects. So there were some of the Egyptians who feared the God of Israel, and some communities of the Jews who received the truth as it is in Jesus.

We are aware that our course, in this respect, will be branded by the "lords spiritual" around us as the *unpardonable sin*. With them, to breathe a whisper, however true, that can be construed into disrespect for the sect to which they belong, "is as the sin of witchcraft." It is "infidelity," "atheism." Their divine origin, and divine authority must not be questioned. Very well, we will not stop now to inquire whether these organizations are to be considered, in some sense, divine institutions:—if they are, those who pervert them are only the more guilty.—Or whether they are purely voluntary human associations:—if so, our common rights, as members, are disregarded, and we have been oppressed and treated with injustice. If they are shown to be of a mixed character, their guilt is modified to correspond. In any case, their relation to God, his truth, and people, is the same.

With the organizations, however, as such, we have nothing to do, either to tear down or to build up. Let them alone. God is just, and "that day" will make all right.

But for all the institutions of the word of God, we entertain the highest veneration. His Church, his ministers, his Sabbaths, his sacraments and ordinances, all have a sacredness and significance to us even greater than formerly.

But we cannot admit, without becoming papists and pharisees outright, that the mere formal and customary observance of an institution is of any real virtue, or that the simple fact of an outward separation to an office, gives the character and authority of the office. And most certainly it would be glaring impiety to admit, that those who sanction such a corruption, can turn it into a license for rejecting the truth and opposing the declared purposes of the Great Author of all religious worship. 2 Tim. iii. 1—9. *"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God: having a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof: from such turn away. Ever learning, and never*

ABLE TO COME TO THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRUTH. *Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth : men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further : for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was."*

A mere name and title is a dubious certificate of character, and the necessity of resorting to them always indicates a corrupt and perverted condition of things.

When the title and badges of royalty must be referred to by princes to command respect, we may be very sure that the virtues which first invested the title and the badge with honor are wanting; and when the sacred title must be referred to by "the church," to give weight and authority to the opinion which claims to be decisive, we usually find the old apostolic character and divinity of argument are wanting.

It used to be the case, that men were deemed true apostles, "servants of Jesus Christ," because they believed and preached, and practised the truth; *now* it is assumed that what a man may speak, is the truth, because he claims to be an apostle. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," is the old apostolic maxim. Now, in settling a plain scriptural question, "the oracles of God" are virtually rejected; now a man is treated, by our popular apostles, with insult and scorn, for supposing that "the oracles of God" can give us sufficient light to decide such a question. "Which of you convinceth me of sin, and if I tell you the truth, why do you not believe me?" said the Savior to his adversaries. We make the same demand. If we are wrong, "convince" or show us where the wrong is, by the word of God. If we are right, why do you not believe the truth? Almost everything else but such an attempt to *convince*, that mere worldly policy could dictate or allow, has been done by the sects, in their treatment of those who are looking, as they believe the word of God authorizes, for the fulfilment of the promise of Christ that he "*will come again.*" As it was *with "certain of the Synagogue of the Libertines, Cyrenians and Alexandrians, which arose, disputing with Stephen—and they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake; then they suborned men, which said We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God, and they stirred up the people, &c., and SET UP FALSE WITNESSES,"* in order to effect the destruction of those whom God had raised up as witnesses of

his truth, (see Acts vi. 8—12.)—So have the sects done to the Adventists, by their acknowledged public agents, through the pulpit and the press. As it was with Paul at Ephesus, when “*he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing, and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God; but when divers were HARDENED, and BELIEVED NOT, but SPAKE EVIL of that way before the multitude, he DEPARTED from them, and SEPARATED the disciples,*” and these hardened evil speakers afterwards reported that he taught “*all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses.*” (Compare Acts xix. 9, and xxi. 21.) So have the sects treated the Adventists, charging them with being opposed to the church and to God. To the sects, therefore, as such, we have no apology to make.

Again, our apology is not intended for *all* who *profess* to be Christians. Pray, then, for whom may it be intended? That is what we wish to have understood. We must therefore attempt a classification, which we hope will make the thing more clear to our readers, and so far will be convenient, if it should be of no farther value. It shall be according to truth, however, and scriptural. But it would require too much time to enter upon a very minute analysis.

Our readers are doubtless familiar with the ingenious and characteristic philosophy of Dr. Pond, in accounting for some of the otherwise unaccountably strange things in “Millerism.” The philosophic principle was developed in words to this effect,—“Though good is done by ‘Millerism,’ and good men are engaged in it, still, *Millerism is of the devil!*”

Very well, we must not lightly esteem the *discoveries* of this age of marvels. The philosophy may be of service in other cases. It must be orthodox, of course, and “the church” cannot complain of us when countenanced by such authority; though we prefer even better authority than that in all cases.

If we turn to the Great Master, we see, not to notice still more specific traits, these three distinctly marked forms of character among his reputed disciples. There was the “*Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile,*” and “*that disciple whom Jesus loved,*” and “*Mary,*” who “*loved much.*” These may be looked upon as a class by themselves; and in a peculiar sense may be called *the Lord's*

*disciples.* Then there was Thomas and Peter, often the subjects of reproof. These were a different class. Christ once said to Peter, "*Get thee behind me, Satan.*" He certainly may be called, in some sense, *the devil's disciple.* Again, there was one of whom Christ declares, without any qualification, that he was "*a devil.*"

It would be claiming too much, even for *this* age, right on the eve of the millennium, as we are supposed to be, to doubt that the same varieties exist in the professed church now. That these have all felt a deep interest in the Millerites, is not to be doubted; and that they have all invited or demanded us to "come back,"—that is, to give up our faith, or, which would amount to the same thing, to accommodate them and the world by keeping it to ourselves,—is very clear. For, that there are some, even of the Marys and Johns, who do not understand the import of the plainest Advent prophecies, we must admit.

But stop. The design of our apology makes it important that we should place out here, in a conspicuous light, the result of our analysis. Dr. Pond's philosophy, and our scriptural classification, require that we denominate the several classes of professed Christians as follows,—1. *The Lord's Christians.* 2. *The devil's Christians.* And, 3. *Christian devils.* But we cannot think of making an apology to all of them. And most certainly not to the last of the above classes. If there were no other reason, their prominent traits of character would place them beyond the reach of any apology which we could make. One of these traits is well known. It gives them a peculiar attraction for "*the bag,*" and "*that which is put therein.*" But mark, nothing is said of *giving*, as the Lord's disciples will gladly do; but the *end* and *object* of their calling and profession is "*the bag,*" as their thoughts and reasonings and labors are all adapted to "*put therein!*" They may be distinguished by genius and learning, and possibly have part in the "apostleship;" but their logic, be the text what it may, is always characterized by the most barefaced hypocrisy. It may appear to express great sympathy for "*the poor,*" and the most rigid economy in order to meet their wants; while the real object would be to get the offerings of generous and holy affection, from the "*burial preparation of the body*" of Christ, into *the bag.* So the familiar specimen of its logic is interpreted, by those who detected the "thief" among the first apostles.

In our day it may appear to express great apprehensions that the weak will become insane, and its first proposition may be a perjury, which, ascribing cases of insanity to a cause which came into existence long after the cases themselves were known to exist; while, at the same time, the authors of the perjury may be making ten cases to one that could be fairly attributed to the alleged cause, and perfectly indifferent to all other cases, unless the provisions made for them could be put into *the bag*.

It may appear to express the most tender watchfulness over the industry and happiness of the public, in dwelling upon some rare case of improvidence, connected, in spite of itself, with an unpopular and unprofitable cause, while the logician would shrink with horror at the thought of introducing into the pulpit, as a subject of warning, a popular evil which was known to spread desolation and death broadcast over the land, at the risk of losing a farthing of the profits of the desolation from *the bag*.

It may be eloquent and loud in the cry of "humbug," and "speculation," against those who are laboring night and day to "hold forth the word of life" for the salvation of men, with scarcely "a place to lay their heads," and have been so unguarded as to provoke these complaints by giving their authors to fear "that the hope of their gains was gone," gains which they have accumulated as the apostles of the cherished *Christian "humbugs"* of the day, which are peopling hell by multitudes; or by beguiling the public into an investment of capital in publications, institutions and societies, to be returned by a millennium, which has for its charter, documents similar to those which "insure" the purchaser "a first rate crop of wheat or other grain," from "water lots," as delightful and romantic as could be found right under the Falls of Niagara.

We do not say that all, who allow the logic to pass as current, are of the class under consideration, because we know there were those connected with the scripture specimen of the class—the "thief" to whom we have alluded—who were glad to put their "silver" into his bag, as soon as he was ready to aid them in putting out of the way "a disturber of the church," who used the word of God, the prophecies in particular, in a manner so utterly fatal to them. And who will have the presumption to say that they were of this class? However *pious* they were ready to pronounce his



work to be, it was altogether too mean, because it was too unpopular, for them to perform. We wish it may be understood, then, that *all* who use the logic of Christian devils, may not be Christian devils.

And there certainly are but few of this class who could be affected by any apology which we could make. To be effectual with them, it must be more *solid* and *shining*, and "*bag*"-able than we could make it. And besides that, our most earnest prayer is,—as the Savior's cause in our hands cannot be supposed to be any more safe than it was in his own,—from Christian devils, good Lord deliver us!

The claims of the other two classes upon our attention are of a different character, and shall be duly considered. The character of the second class—the devil's Christians—is remarkably fruitful in its practical lessons. We wish to notice some of their prominent traits, on account of their bearing on the prophecies. The name of this class may seem to be paradoxical, but it is not too much so to express the truth, and we may as well use "plainness of speech."

Every body knows that there are, as there always have been, different kinds of Christians. Nothing is more common than to find good men who are not great men, and great men who are not good men; so it is no strange thing to find the Christian head where the Christian heart is wanting; or the Christian heart where the Christian head is wanting; or any combination of these extremes.

With Peter before us as the primary pattern, we shall be struck with this, as a very prominent trait of the class: a remarkable readiness and confidence in advancing the prevailing theories of the church. Secondly, great apparent benevolence in the application of their theories; and, thirdly, an exhibition of very little knowledge of the word of God. At any rate, all this is true of the original representative of the class, or the Savior would never have addressed him with these severe words, "*Get thee behind me, SATAN, thou art an offence to me; for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.*"

We need not ask these brethren, as Paul did Agrippa, Do ye *believe* the prophets? we know that you believe *them*. What is the true *interpretation*? is the question with you. And here is the ground for the different positions which we occupy.

Now to the *apology*! But to you, brother Peter, and to

those who think with you, it must be framed with a view to this supposition.—One of two things must be true ; your view of the prophecies, or ours, must be false, and, so far, must be of the devil ; and you must not complain, for we are driven to this position by those to whom your side of the question has been entrusted by your election or consent. They have charged it upon us, and you have consented that the doctrine we preach *is of the devil*. This has been assumed, we know, without an argument or proof from the word of God. It has been done apparently, just as the Pharisees assumed that Christ was “mad,” or had “a Devil,” because he differed from them, and they could not meet him fairly. Let it, then, *be remembered*, that this is the position taken by *your side* of the question.

Indulge us here again with a preparatory remark or two.

You do not need to be reminded, brethren, that the *popularity* of a theory is no proof of its truth. No expectation could have been more popular than that which led Peter astray, and subjected him to the reproof we have before quoted. Even the poor misguided rabble among the Jews were so imbued with it, that they broke forth in shouts before the Savior, as he entered their capital, “Hosanna to the King of Israel !”

Nor is the *piety* of those who believe a theory, in itself, any evidence of its truth. There can be no doubt of Peter's piety. The confession of Peter, if not itself the rock, involves the foundation rock of the church, against which God has promised, “the gates of hell shall not prevail.”

Its apparent *benevolence* is no proof of its truth. It was the idea that Christ was to suffer many things, “and be killed,” which called forth Peter's well intended, but unauthorized, “rebuke,” “*That be far from thee, (Margin, ‘pity thyself,’) Lord, this shall not be unto thee.*”

The apparent superiority of a theory in exhibiting the *goodness of God*, is no evidence of its truth. If the theory of Peter had been verified, and Christ had not “suffered,” the grand exhibition of the goodness and love and mercy of God, as contemplated by the plan of redemption, must have fallen to the ground.

Again, a theory may apparently be sustained by the *word of God*, and yet not be true. That was the capital artifice of the great deceiver, by which the greater part of the Jewish church were taken in the snare, from which Peter himself

was "scarcely saved." Their minds were so dazzled in the contemplation of the truth which did *not* belong to their times, that they could not understand that truth, the development of which was passing right before their eyes.

Let us repeat this important proposition. A theory may be popular—it may appear to be benevolent—it may appear to afford a superior and commanding exhibition of the goodness of God—it may be believed by good men—and, above all, it may appear to be sustained by the word of God ; and yet it may be so disguised by the father of lies, as to be subversive of the whole truth of God, and his great plan of salvation, and become the most successful instrumentality of the adversary in leading the professed church to reject and kill their lawful and appointed Head, and thus bring upon themselves swift destruction !

The *truth* of a theory must therefore be tested, solely, by

"WHAT IS WRITTEN"—

by "*every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,*" in reference to the questions it involves.

We are, therefore, constrained to take the position before confessed, because, 1. It is admitted on all hands, that we stand on the plain apostolic and primitive foundation, as to *the events* for which we are looking, and *the interpretation of the prophecies* which speak of those events. 2. Because those to whom your side of the question has been entrusted, and who have so ungenerously complained of us as "ignorant babblers," have not only failed to give us anything better, instead of these views ; but, 3. It has become a serious question with us, whether they have not proved themselves to be the "false teachers" and "scoffers" of "the last times," who should deny "the promise of the Lord's coming"—whether they are not "the wicked," of whom we are commanded to "beware," who "wrest the scriptures to their own destruction ?"

You may reply, "these are great men." They are not greater than "the angels that sinned," or than the "magicians" of Egypt, or "the astrologers of Babylon" were of old. Do you add, "but they are good men !" So these angels were once good ; and certainly no man should claim for them a better name or standing than Peter had.

We will now endeavor to sustain the preceding propo-

sitions. And in doing this we shall make use only of testimony which cannot be suspected of any intentional partiality to our side of the question. 1. That the apostles looked forward to the *personal return* of the Lord Jesus, as the crowning point in the future prospects of the church—believing that He would, at *his return*, “judge the world in righteousness”—and, separating the righteous from the wicked, gather together all the blessed of his Father, including the dead in Christ, to “inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world”—punish the wicked—and, after “*the heavens and earth which are now* should pass away with a great noise, make all things new,” i. e. “new heavens and a new earth,” over which Christ should be king, and his people possess it forever—even forever and ever—and that this arrangement is connected with “times and seasons,” God having “appointed a day in which” these things should take place.—This is so familiar to you, brethren, that we need not spend a moment in reminding you of the proof. That every historian who speaks of the faith of the early church testifies to this fact, whether the writers may have regarded it as a fault or a virtue, is equally evident.

2. Our adversaries have failed to give us anything better instead of these views of the prophecies. We can notice only the most prominent of them. And to do this in the order in which they entered the field, we must begin with Mr. Dowling. Omitting several important and palpable mis-statements which lie upon the face of his work, we present the testimony of an impartial witness as to its general character. Dr. Breckenridge speaks of it as follows :—

“As for this disquisition of Mr. Dowling, we may confidently say that it is hardly to be conceived that anything could be printed by Mr. Miller, or Mr. Any-body-else, more shallow, absurd and worthless. There is hardly a point he touches, on which he has not managed to adopt the very idlest conjectures of past writers on the prophecies ; and this so entirely without regard to any coherent system, that the only clear conviction a man of sense or reflection could draw from his pamphlet, if such a man could be supposed capable of believing it, would be that the prophecies themselves are a jumble of nonsense.”—*Spirit of the XIXth Century*.

We refer next to Prof. Stuart. With his work our readers are familiar. While we acknowledge its excellences, in the general principles which it lays down, and which the author seems to have disregarded entirely, so far as the application of them is attempted, we cannot but regard it in its ex-

pository character, as utterly unworthy a Christian. One considerable objection to it, if there were no others, is this: The *date* which he gives to the book of Revelation, *destroys its character as a prophecy*. He has noticed, (page 91,) the charge of Porphyry against the prophecy of Daniel, that it was written *after the events took place*. If Porphyry had preferred the charge against the Revelator, the Professor would have gone very far in sustaining the infidel, and in proving the truth of his charge. We do not refer here to the fact that the authorities most worthy of being considered, place the banishment of John under Domitian, and date the prophecy accordingly, in A. D. 95—97, a fact which we should have supposed worthy of a "hint," at least, from one so remarkable for his "modesty" and concern for "the reproach of the church." But according to the Professor himself, "the *leading* and *essential* parts of the book" may certainly be as much history as prophecy.

Here is the clue to his date of the communication to John:—

"It was only *after the Roman army was in Palestine, and had begun THEIR TASK, that the time* (when Jerusalem was to be destroyed,) *was DECLARED TO JOHN. Rev. xi. 2.*" (P. 144.)

Was the Professor "inspired to explain" this item of the prophecy? or is it "conceit and conjecture?" or, further, a specimen of "theological romance?"

We may learn the more definite date from the following:—

"The time when the imperial power of Rome, i. e., Nero, made a formal declaration of war against Judea, and commissioned Vespasian and his son to execute his hostile determination, may be fairly taken as the *terminus a quo* of the Jewish war. . . . This commission appears to have been given *in the latter part of the winter of A. D. 67.*" (Page 117.)

How long "after" this, the communication was made "to John," the Professor does not inform us.

But "the great and leading event of the writer" of the Revelation, according to our Professor, was "the end of Nero's life and persecution," which, i. e., the persecution he supposes to be "the sum of Rev. xi." and also of the 12th, 13th, and 17th chapters in particular, (pages 115—129.) This "great and leading event" is thus recorded:—

"Turn we now to the pages of history, and we shall find that Nero commenced his horrible persecutions of Christians about the middle, or in the latter part of Nov. A. D. 64. All agree that this persecution ended

immediately on the death of Nero; and this took place on the day that Galba entered Rome and was proclaimed emperor, i. e., on the 9th of June, A. D. 68." (Page 127.)

As to anything that is said by John or the Professor, then, "the great and leading event" of the prophecy—"the end of Nero's life and persecution"—"was declared to John *after the Roman army was in Palestine, and HAD BEGUN THEIR TASK;*" (they were "*not ready to march upon Judea* from Antioch until some time in the month of May, A. D. 67,") and "the end of Nero's life" "*took place on the 9th of June, A. D. 68.*"

But you may reply, "It is possible the book of Revelation *may* be prophecy, in 'its *essential* parts,' even allowing the matter to stand as the Professor has arranged it.—And perhaps our champion could show you that John had the parts of the book communicated to him at different times."

We do not deny that it *may be prophecy*, on his theory, but the Porphyrys of our day are not such "*FIRST of April men,*" (see "Hints" p. 173,) as to feel that there is any necessity for *them* to labor in undermining the argument from prophecy in favor of Christianity, when the argument is modified so much to their satisfaction by a learned defender of the faith. And that the Professor ever supposed that the different "parts," of the book were given "to John" at different times, is not to be thought of for a moment. "All are agreed," at least, so far as we are concerned, that the book is "*The Revelation.*" And you know he more than "hints" that his brother Duffield, for whose views, by the way, we have no particular sympathy, is half a "*barbarian,*" because he "quotes this book by a new title, viz., *Revelation,*" (p. 170.) No, no. It is an "august drama," with its "prologue," and "epilogue," and "catastrophes," and "the person he introduces upon the scene," &c. It is "*The Revelation,*" all given at one time, as John himself informs us, (Rev. i. 10—12 seq.) in a manner so particular as to assure us, that if there had been any interruption he would have stated it.

Brethren, while we gladly and cheerfully grant that you believe *the prophets*, and that the only question in the case is, *what is the true interpretation?* we beg of you not to do us the injustice to expect that we shall be affected by any "Hints on Interpretation," which open the way for a suspicion that this portion of the word of God is prophecy.

But the difficulties multiply as we advance in the Professor's "straight and simple path." Admitting it to be possible, that he could, in his way, make it appear that "the *leading* and *essential* parts of the book" are "properly *prediction*," we confess we do not see, as the Professor appears to, such a wonderful adaptation of "the writer" to his design.

"It lies upon the face of the Apocalypse, from beginning to end, *that it was written in the midst of a bitter and bloody persecution of the church.* The writer himself is in exile, "on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," Rev. i. 9; and the persons whom he addresses are exposed, or speedily to be exposed, to all the hardships, perils, and temptations, which result from persecution. Of course his object is to guard, to guide, to fortify, and to console Christians in such circumstances; and never did a writer cleave more fully to his purpose, or execute it more effectually." "The great and leading event, however, which the writer had particularly in view, viz., the end of Nero's life and persecution, was to take place *speedily*." (Pp. 109, 129.)

Let it here be noted, 1. That "the writer himself is in exile. 2. That "the exact time" of "the end of Nero's life and persecution" was not "declared to John" until "after the Roman army was in Palestine and had begun their task, and that they were not ready to march from Antioch upon Judea, until some time in the month of May, A. D. 67; and, 3, That the end of Nero's life and persecution took place on the 9th of June, A. D. 68."

Now these queries arise:—Do the "facts of history" show that John was allowed to leave his "exile" in Patmos, to *deliver* his "book" before "the end of Nero's life and persecution," in order "to guard, to guide," &c?—or that there was time, "after the Romans had begun their task," for John to *send* his book to "the persons whom he addresses," before "the event," which "ended the persecution, took place?" If not, "must we involve John" or the Professor "in the charge of having failed to execute his purpose, or of having executed it in a feeble or unsatisfactory manner?" To us the view of the Professor is very "unsatisfactory," particularly when we call to mind that impartial witnesses testify that "the Romans" were extremely reluctant to "enter upon their task," and that the Revelation was not known to the church before A. D. 95—97; while in the case of your champion, as you must be fully aware, there is no concealment of *partiality*, and that his work is by no means to be considered any *better* than a "theological romance."

A still greater objection remains. This "beast" of a "Nero!" Is he dead, or is he *not* dead? "But, trifling apart, (and in fact these matters are too grave to trifle with, when one can help it,) what are we now to say?" For "if philology is to be trusted," and "the common laws of language are not to be set aside," it is just as certain as that Professor S. is right in his "interpretation" of "the beast," that the prediction of "the soothsayers" and "the Sibylline Oracles," to whom John is assumed to have accommodated his prophecy, were fulfilled, and Nero was alive and at his work of persecution *two years*, at least, after the above date of his death. "The beast" is thus interpreted:—

"Who this beast was, we cannot, after the explanations given in Rev. xvii., well doubt. *The persecuting power of imperial pagan Rome, and specially that power as exercised by NERO*, is, beyond all reasonable question, symbolized by the beast described in Rev. xiii. 3, seq. . . . . Whenever the *beast* is distinguished from the seven heads, it then is employed as a *generic* symbol of the imperial power; but when particular and specific actions or qualities of a personal and distinctive nature are predicated of the beast, it designates the imperial power is individually exercised, e. g. by Nero: That Nero was in the exercise of his power when John wrote the Apocalypse, seems to be quite plain from Revelation xvii. 10. 'Five [kings] are fallen; one is; the other has not yet come, but when he shall come, he will continue but a short time. The *five fallen* are Julius Cesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius. Of course *Nero* is the sixth; and he is therefore the one *who now is*.' . . . . But there are other things in the Apocalypse which serve also to characterize Nero, so as hardly to leave room for mistake. Thus in chap. xiii. 3: "[I saw] one of his heads [viz. of the beast] as it were smitten unto death; and his deadly wound was healed. . . . . It was PREDICTED by SOOTHSAYERS of Nero, early in his reign, that he would be deprived of his office, flee his country, go to the East, and there recover dominion, especially in Palestine. . . . . In consequence of this, the great mass of the community, at that period, do not appear to have believed in the reality of Nero's death at the time when he was assassinated. . . . . Passages in abundance are to be found in parts of the SIBYLLINE ORACLES, some of which were written about A. D. 80, and others early in the second century, which show most plainly how vivid the persuasion was, that Nero would again make his appearance, notwithstanding his apparently deadly wound. . . . . If the reader is satisfied, with me, that John might describe Nero in this way, it will be easy to show him how well the description comports with the substance of the COMMON RUMOR. According to this, Nero was to be assassinated, and to receive a wound apparently deadly, and yet to recover from it. So says Rev. xiii. 3, 'One of the heads [i. e. Nero] was smitten as it were unto death, and yet his deadly wound was healed.' What can be more exact! . . . . . COMMON REPORT made Nero, after reigning a while, to disappear for some time, then to make his appearance again, as if he had come up from the regions of the dead, and finally to perish. So Rev. xvii. 8, 'The beast which thou sawest, was, and is not, and



will come up from the abyss [the world of the dead, or the grave,] and go to destruction." . . . . Enough to show the probability, I might almost say the certainty, that Nero is aimed at in this part of the Apocalypse. This supposed, all the difficulties of the writer's language appear to be solved, and everything moves on harmoniously." (Pp. 120.—127.)

We mean to place the Professor's view in its true light, though we have not room to quote farther; and it is unnecessary, as you, of course, are well acquainted with the work. And this, be it remembered, is the man who complains of other expositors in this language:—

"But the advocates of double sense have brought us into company with the interpreters of enigmas, charades, conundrums, and heathen oracles of *double entendre*, and invited us to keep pace with them."

But to return. If the Professor is right—and this beast was Nero,—he was alive after A. D. 68. In the history of the witnesses, Rev. xi., it is predicted, verse 7:—"And when they shall have *finished their testimony*, the *beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit* shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, *and kill them.*" Who were these witnesses? Here is the "interpretation":—

The sum of Rev. xi., is, then, that the Romans would invade and tread down Palestine *for three and a half years*, and that Christians, *during that period*, would be bitterly persecuted and slain." . . . .  
 "Although the great mass of Christians fled from before them, (the Zealot-party) and the Romans, so as to save their lives, yet all did not and could not retreat. Many remained in their country, faithful confessors of Christianity even unto death. Against these *witnesses* (see Rev. xi. 3,) or martyrs, the great body of the Jews are represented as arraying themselves, in Rev. xi. 3—12, and as persecuting them unto death. For a while, the miraculous powers of some of the Christian teachers overawed their malignant enemies, Rev. xi. 5, 6. But at last the faithful witnesses were destroyed. *The period of consummating their destruction* is limited, however, *in the same manner as that of the subjugation of Palestine.* (Pp. 118, 119.)

When did this "period" terminate? Here is the "history."

"Let us now resort to history, and see what the result of an inquiry respecting *facts* will be. . . . . If we *suppose* now that the former part of February, A. D. 67, was the month when war was declared, or the commission made out, we shall find that three years and six months elapsed between this period and the taking of Jerusalem and destroying it, on the 10th of Aug. A. D. 70." (Pp. 116, 117.)

Now this is a plain case. By all "*the common laws of language,*" and keeping in view "*the generic*" and "*the*

*specific*" properties of the beast, as defined by our Professor, "if his philology is to be trusted," this beast who slays the witnesses, *must be Nero*. And they were not slain, according to his own showing, until "A. D. 70." Ergo, was not Nero, who died A. D. 68, alive A. D. 70?

His "path is straight and simple," and "all moves on harmoniously," as he says; but to us there is an "*enigma*" somewhere. Is it to be ascribed to John or the "expositor?" Who can tell? If we suppose "the soothsayers, John," & Co., were right in their "predictions," and that Nero had ascended out of the bottomless pit, it would not only spoil the claims of the former to the prophetic character, but it would place them in a worse light than to call them "first of April men;" for, according to our author, they went on *predicting* his return long after "A. D. 70." If we suppose he might here have had in mind "the great body of the Jews," of whom he speaks, as the beast, that would place him among "the *double sense* expositors." And Nero himself, with all the monsters of the Apocalypse, as abominations, in his estimation, are not to be compared with them. That would never do.

If we suppose, again, in violation of all "the rules of language" and "logic," that "the *genera*" may possess all the properties of *the species*, and that the Professor committed a slight fault in his zoological arrangement, still, "*the generic*" interpretation will not clear the "path." Because the "expositor" has not *assumed* nor *discovered* that the soothsayers or John predicted that "*the empire*" was to "go into the bottomless pit," which it must do in order to "*ascend* out of" it; nor is there any "history," "report" or "rumor" brought forward to show that any event of that kind "took place" at that time.

"What shall we say?" Is it to be said of this "*sober*" and "intellectual" "expositor" as he says of others, "where the reins are given without check to fancy and imagination, difficulties of this kind are *leaped over* instead of being removed?"

What then can be done? Not to commit the profanation of calling in the aid of "the interpreters of enigmas, charades, conundrums, and heathen oracles," is any help to be obtained from "philology—hermeneutics—exegesis—enlightened criticism—theological acumen—lexicons—grammars—vernacular power over language—*usus loquendi*—ration-

alism or intellectualism, as the *Supreme Court* ?" Or must we set these all down as nothing more than

"GREAT SWELLING WORDS OF VANITY"

in the case ? Or shall we, giving "a double sense" to his own words, allow that "the whole subject *is at rest* ?" Yes, verily. For he has told us, and we fully believe it—"No principles of hermeneutics CAN BE SOUND, *which makes the Bible CONTRADICT ITSELF.*"

It would occupy too much of our time and room to notice in detail, all the half quoted, and of course, unfairly quoted portions of the word of God in the Professor's work, with the "bold" and impious assumptions, in plain contradiction of the Bible, and of his own laws of interpretation, as applied when these assumptions are not in view. We must, however, notice one item in his "scheme of interpretation," which will show at once how readily his "taste" and "presumption" can "set aside" the testimony of God, where, as he confesses, the laws of interpretation forbid it. He says, p. 134 :—

"The assumption so often made, that *the end of the world* is immediately to follow the overthrow of Gog and Magog, is by no means certain, nor even at all probable."

It is not improbable that our readers may here ask, Does the Professor consider it by any "means certain, or even at all probable," that "*the end of the world*" is *ever* to "follow the overthrow of Gog and Magog ?" or to come at all. That is a difficult question to settle. We can tell you what *he says*, p. 181 :—

"Paul puts the resurrection of saints at *the end of the world*, 1 Cor. xv. 24. 'Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power.'"

Again, p. 169 :—

"When the great period of man's probation and the process of redeeming sinners shall be completed—when (as Paul says) *the end cometh*—then all will be *restored*. A new heaven and a new earth will arise."

Now, keeping this in mind, mark "the period" which he asserts it is "certain" or "probable" is to "follow the overthrow of Gog and Magog," at the end of the millennium.

"The thousand years of triumph to the church we have seen not to be strictly universal. *Numbers as the sand of the sea* are still in the regions of Gog and Magog. And shall one thousand years only, of the reign of Christianity thus limited, be allowed for the Redeemer's triumph, and more than *six thousand* for Satan's? Forbid it, all that is benevolent in the Godhead! Forbid it, dying love of Jesus! Forbid it, all the precious promises which the words of everlasting truth present." (P. 138.)

This, certainly is as *bold* and *benevolent* as Peter's rebuke of Christ. We shall see presently, if it is any better authorized by "what is written." He proceeds:—

"Whether we have respect to the millennium, usually so named, or to a more prosperous period still, near the close of time, the extravagant apprehensions so often entertained and avowed respecting this season of prosperity, seem quite unworthy of credit. The prophets have indeed employed most glowing language, in describing the future season of prosperity; and all they have said will doubtless prove to be true, in the sense which they meant to convey. But let him who interprets these passages remember well, that they are *poetry*, and are replete in an unusual degree with figurative language and poetic imagery. . . . . Are we to be told in earnest, that men will, at some future period, be born destitute of any taint, or free from any evil consequence of Adam's fall, and that they will be without sin, and need no regeneration or sanctification? . . . . . A great diminution of evil of every kind we may well expect, when the latter day of glory shall come. But men will still be frail dying creatures, and undergo pain and decay. They will be imperfect in holiness, and will need admonition and correction." (Pp. 147, 148.)

This is "*to follow* the overthrow of Gog and Magog," and yet he repeatedly proves that "man's probation" ends with "the general judgment."

Now, to one who makes such solemn declarations, that he believes "*the Bible means what it says*," we should suppose it was made "probable," at least, if not "certain," that "the general judgment" is connected with "the overthrow of Gog and Magog." What says the Revelator? "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And *the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone*, where the beast and the false prophet are, and *shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever*."—Rev. xx. 7—10. Will the Pro-

fessor's "hermeneutics" show that the devil does not go with Gog and Magog, *finally*, at their overthrow, into the lake of fire? What can make it more *certain*?

When does this event "take place?" Hear Peter, who, in his argument to sustain the terrible prediction he had uttered in reference to the "false teachers," that "their judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not," says:—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."—2 Peter ii. 4.

The testimony of Jude is the same, verse 6:—"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, HE HATH RESERVED IN EVERLASTING CHAINS UNDER DARKNESS UNTO THE JUDGMENT OF THE GREAT DAY." So also Matt. xxv., which the Professor himself applies to the general judgment: "The separation of the two parties—sheep and goats—is affirmed by Christ to be complete, universal, and of eternal duration—verses 32, 46." (Page 171.)

Then, "if" the word of God "is to be trusted," "hermeneutics" to the contrary notwithstanding, Christ will say to the wicked, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels;" and then, as the Professor and ourselves are agreed, "the separation of the two parties—sheep and goats—is to be complete, universal, and of eternal duration."

And is it, after all this, "by no means certain, or even at all probable, that *the end of the world* is immediately to follow the overthrow of Gog and Magog?" "What shall we say now to such argumentation as this? It would be difficult to find in any or all the adventurous works on the prophecies which have hitherto made their appearance, anything which exceeds this, either in boldness of assertion, or in unfounded and presumptuous criticism and philology." Will he too "continue the connection of the sheep and goats for *centuries*, after a final separation is asserted by Christ" and himself "to be made?" Are we to have more than one "*final*" judgment? or is there to be "sin and death" after that, as also during the Millennium? If the devil is to be cast into the lake of fire with Gog and Magog, and that is to take place in the judgment of the great day, and this is to be at the end of the world, what becomes of the Professor's *assumption* and *latter-day glory*?

"These are fair questions," it must be seen. Surely the Professor has given us "a new tune on the old instrument," that must place him fairly in competition with "Jacob Boehmen and Emanuel Swedenborg"—"sober and educated, in possession of his reason, and serious in its defence," as he appears to be. "He brings forward, and gravely and earnestly commends to the reception of the Christian public, fancies, extravagances, puerilities, contradictions—and these in respect to subjects of the gravest nature too—even more improbable and more revolting to the simple-hearted reader of the Scriptures, than the *grain* or the *grape story* of father Papias." "Then our safety lies in adopting and *following out* the common, well-known, and well-established principles of interpretation."

We "have only to add, then, that a man may as well ask us "to trample under foot" the Revelation, "and with this a large portion of the New Testament also, as to ask us to believe in such a scheme of *interpretation*."

"The one half is not yet told—but enough." Enough to show that this champion of the anti-advent hosts, who has covered and led on and sustained the tumultuous clan of all sects and no sects, refined and vulgar, in their warfare of lies, and slander, and sophistry, and scoffing, and blasphemy, has given us nothing better instead of the doctrine he has thus assailed.

We might leave him here, but we may be pardoned for dwelling a little in such a case. Though we stand vindicated, as to this particular, the truth of God demands that we say a word in its defence. And what shall we say of "an author" who, "from one stage of development to another, moves on, now vehemently urging the absolute and indispensable obligation to construe every expression," as "bearing its *plain* and *primary sense*, unless *good reason can be given* why it should be tropically understood, and then winking everything of this nature entirely out of sight, or trampling it under foot?" Out of his own mouth shall he be judged. "*I do not stop to argue with such expositors.*" "I protest against such an abuse of reason, of the holy Scriptures, and of all the established principles of language. That book is no toy for the sport of fancy and caprice."

He stands convicted of having violated every one of his own maxims, and falls under every censure he has pronounced. The rankest demagogue of the Grecian or Roman, or

even of the French schools, with ambition and tyranny in his heart, never seemed more sensitive for the *public good* than he pretends to be for "the church," or to feel a greater dread of kings and tyrants, than he has of "enthusiasts," and "*romancers*;" and no demagogue ever exhibited a greater want of sense or sincerity in carrying his declamations into practice. The "laws of interpretation" with him, like the laws of the state with them, must yield to "*taste*."

With the most winning air of "modesty," his unbounded and unpardonable presumption leads him rashly to "assume," that the "*prophecy which came not by the will of man, but was spoken by holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*," and which has been the beacon "light" to the church, thus far on her "dark" and stormy voyage, is only "*poetry*." And that which the "servant of Jesus Christ" portrays of the glorious imagery unfolded to him by "The Spirit" of God, at the command to "*write; for these words are true and faithful!*" and connected with the promise, "*He that overcometh shall inherit all (margin, these) things: and I will be his God, and he shall be my son;*"—all this is "assumed" to be "not properly *prediction*," but mere "description, which is intended for the very purpose of creating emotion in the breast of his readers!"

While making the loudest pretensions to "*consistency*," of which we have already had specimens enough, he seizes upon the testimony of "Victorinus, 'that Nero was the beast who received the deadly wound,'" and is evidently disappointed that he can find so little even of that, gathered as it is from a period most rank with "*putid fables*," and yet no words could condemn the theological speculations of that period more severely than his own.

His bad "taste," scarcely disguised by his awkward and sophistical pretensions to Christian and classic refinement, loathes the manna of truth, retained, to be sure, in earthen vessels; and, as it must be, in the nature of things, mixed more or less with ignorance and error; while it loads itself, "*ad nauseam*," with "*putid fables*" which a pure "Christian taste" would have rejected, and enlightened Christian candor would have corrected by the word of God. That which was used rather as *spice*, by those whom he would have us regard as "barbarians," he serves up for a *full meal*. But why should we not allow to our Professor the benefit of

his discovery, and the privilege of proving the truth of his own statement, that "there is no sect, and no *enthusiast*, which may not find some prototype among the ancients!"

He not only "calls in question a mode of interpretation generally adopted, and which has long been current among us;" but gives us "a new" mode, to sustain which he is under the necessity of impeaching the intelligence of the church in every age, in her application of the prophecies, while its reception demands of us a more prodigious "*faith (alias credulity)*" than he ascribes to "Tertulian," or even to his brother "Duffield." And yet he has the assurance to "hope for the suffrages of the sober and inquiring part of the community," in their selection of a leader to "travel in the dark to some *terra firma*." "Well, be it so." We have followed him in the "straight and simple path," in which he says he has "endeavored to walk," (verily, there is an end to his "Washingtonianism,") without the millennium of Father Papias. (See Hints, p. 194.) We have seen how "all moves on harmoniously," we have seen "all at rest;" and what must be his "*terra firma*?" It surely must be that, to which so many are now journeying by Hawthorne's "Celestial Railroad."

He has thus confirmed the old opinion, that it is the business of doctors and professors to theorise and speculate; and, at the same time, has practised an old device of the devil, of magnifying the errors and improprieties, into which he has seduced Christians at one time, so as to seduce them more successfully into greater ones at another time. For he has thrown open the flood-gates of the ocean which his predecessors only allowed to drip over the dyke.

He has scandalized the prophet of God, by associating him with "heathen oracles" and "soothsayers," and then dares to intimate that the interpretation, to which such impiety gives rise, is "*John's* interpretation." We are aware that an appeal is made to what Christ said, when he asked the Jews by whom their sons cast out devils, and also, what he said of "the unclean spirit;" but the appeal is unworthy of a "critic," to say nothing of the depravity which it indicates. The first case referred to gives us an exhibition of the power of Christ in repelling his bigoted and slanderous enemies, by paying them in their own coin; and the second case is illustrated by what is now before our eyes. If "the unclean spirit" did not prefer the sanctuary of God to morally "de-



sert places," we should not have these "hints on the interpretation of prophecy." Moreover, there was no conceivable motive for the "assumed" accommodation, in the case of John, even supposing that motives which might affect him would affect that which "the Spirit saith unto the churches." For John certainly could have had nothing to fear, from a tyrant whose death could hardly have followed the announcement of his prophecy (?) granting that what the Professor himself has assumed is the truth.

When the High Priests of "the mother of harlots and the abominations of the earth" discovered that they could act the impostor, in cheating the multitude with sham miracles, they found no difficulty in believing the apostles to be impostors. And our Professor appears to be so ready to accommodate his theology to that of "soothsayers" and "heathen oracles," that he finds no difficulty in supposing the Revelator to have been of the same mind.

His "scheme of interpretation" is a libel upon the truth, the faithfulness and the wisdom of God, and yet he complains of "*inuendoes*," which appear to have been let out, and he predicts may be also "in future," that he "is verging towards rationalism." *Towards* rationalism! *Inuendoes* to that effect would be unjust. It would only be a matter of courtesy to suggest to the Professor, whether he has not been long enough at that stage of his journey to *lay off his cloak*!

All this, and more than this, may be said of this champion of your side of the question, who, if Peter were now on earth, (we mean Peter after his conversion from the theory of the popular priests of his day,) standing fast in the apostolic faith, which would require as much grace to do now as ever, it is no difficult thing to suppose he would address him as he did the "sorcerer" of his day,—“O full of all subtilty, and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” and so forth.

Need we to add, that what we have said, has been said from a sense of duty to God, his truth, his church, and our fellow men? We say as he says, we "intend no *personal* disrespect." He may be unconscious of the part he performs, like the Jews who crucified Christ "through ignorance," and "fulfilled the prophecies by condemning him;" so he may be giving us "hints on the interpretation of prophecy," in a sense of which he little dreams.

There is a tide in the affairs of men, and—

“The long-swept wave about to break!”

finds him at the helm upon “its height.” And, “with no standard, no landmark, no compass,” he “hears the surges roar, and the breakers dash,” and means to steer the good ship in a more safe and quiet direction.” But alas, for “the good ship” and her company! they know not the plan of the voyage. They have rejected “the sure word of prophecy, to which we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.” The true warning is unheeded, and the lights by which they are guided are “*ignus fatui*,” the “wandering stars to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever.”

And what shall we more say? for the time would fail us to speak of the whole Jannean host, whose “*faith*” has denied the promises, wrought unrighteousness, opened the mouths of lions, led on the armies of the aliens, put the living to death again; and others have tortured, not granting deliverance unless they would deny the better resurrection. Nor indeed is it necessary, since they have spoken so much to the purpose of each other. Professor Stuart has demolished all that needed demolishing of Mr. Dowling, and Doctor Pond. Professor Bush has demolished all the chronological interpretations of Professors Stuart, Chase, and Stowe, and, of course, the multitude who have been content to echo their “assumptions.” The efforts of Doctor Jarvis and Doctor Weeks, we believe, were suicidal. The rude hands which have thus taken hold of the Captain of the host, have dealt out slaughter in every direction?

Do you not see, brethren, that the popular high priests, who sustain your theory of the prophecies, or at any rate, your side of the question, have, in no ambiguous sense “crucified the Lord of glory?” And that, while they have been doing this work, you have been cowardly enough to deny him? That while the sentinels, to whom the citadel has been entrusted, have betrayed it into the hands of the king’s enemies, you have been like “dumb dogs that cannot bark?” or, to vary the figure, that you have even manifested a measure of that kind of “*charity*,” which we may suppose the wolf would feel towards the tiger, who was intent upon the destruction of the flock, in preference to the shepherd, who

was endeavoring to save the flock? We charge it upon many of you, that it is even so; and unless you weep as "bitterly" as Peter wept, and be "converted," soon the measure of your iniquity will be full, and the wrath come upon you to the uttermost.

Brethren, if our views of the prophecies were so evidently *erroneous*, and the word of God were so clearly in favor of yours, would these, your champions, have taken such a course? did the truth ever meet her adversaries in such a manner before? Never, never. If your millennium, without the personal presence of Christ—without the judgment and first resurrection—is so fully sustained by "what is written," why has it not been made to appear by your champions? or do you agree to give that up entirely? You have been wont to speak of it as a state in which all should know the Lord, from the least to the greatest. That, however, appears to be only "poetry." And your champion, who has "given out that himself is some great one," differing from others who place the millennium in the past, will have it that there "are to be multitudes, like the sand of the sea, opposed to God, throughout the millennium." And that is to be followed by a similar state of things for a long period, "how long he does not pretend to know," before the resurrection, the judgment, and the end of the world. What does all this mean? Have they betrayed *your* cause, as well as the cause of truth, as we understand it? And had you not soul enough to speak out for the truth in *any form*? Have you thus convicted yourselves of savoring not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men? or must we admit that they did the best they could, and that there was nothing to be done for you, but what was worse than nothing? Brethren, we need not inform you that everything divine has its counterfeits. You could detect the counterfeit repentance, faith, &c., and have you yet to learn—

#### THAT THE DEVIL HAS HIS COUNTERFEIT MILLENNIUM?

It remains to be considered whether these anti-advent champions may not be the "false teachers," and "scoffers of the last times, the wicked," of whom Peter admonishes us to "beware."

If we should *assume* the correctness of this application of his predictions and warnings, and be as liberal in their appli-

cation, as it is well known these champions have been, they would have no right to complain. But from them we have nothing to hope; we do not, therefore, write on their account. All we can expect to do is, while we "have compassion on some, making a difference, to save others with fear, pulling them out of the fire." We shall, therefore, make all plain by the word of God, and try to speak in accordance with what he shall speak in the hastening judgment, without equivocation or reservation.

It would not be very convenient here to quote the whole of Peter's epistle, in which these warnings are found, and that is doubtless in your *hands*, at least, so that we need not do it. But if we could persuade you to have the "things always in remembrance," which it contains, we doubt not you would be fully sensible that Peter's "endeavor" in this epistle, was the result of the reproof and the injunction he received from Christ. His whole object is to guard the church against receiving anything as truth, unless "it is written," particularly on "the coming of the Lord."

The prominent subjects of which he speaks in this second epistle, are; 1. The events predicted by the prophets and apostles to take place. 2. The position which would be taken upon the prophecies which speak of these events, "*in the last days*," or about the time they were to be fulfilled, by the "false teachers," the "scoffers," the "wicked," who would "wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction." And, 3. To guard the church against the danger which would arise from their influence.

The events are thus stated:—"Moreover, I will endeavor that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance. For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, WHEN WE MADE KNOWN UNTO YOU THE POWER AND COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount."—2 Peter, i. 15—18. Here Peter refers to the transfiguration, as the time and place where he obtained what he had "made known" of the "coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." It exhibited in miniature, as Christ himself asserted, (Matt. xvi. 27, 28,) the majesty and glory of our Lord, as

well as some of the accompanying events, which are to be fully realized, "in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

Another of these events is thus stated:—"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."—2 Pet. iii. 10. And again:—"Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."—iii. 13.

In reference to the prophecies which speak of these events, the "false teachers" would take a position like that of the "false prophets" of old, in reference to the true prophets, substituting their "damnable heresies" for "that which is written."—"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." "But THERE WERE FALSE PROPHETS ALSO AMONG THE PEOPLE, EVEN AS THERE SHALL BE FALSE TEACHERS AMONG YOU, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies."—2 Peter i. 21; ii. 1.

The scoffers would say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" iii. 4. The fair construction of which would be, "There is no promise of his coming," or, at best, "If there is any such promise, it is a doubtful one." The apostle closes with this warning: "Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness."—2 Peter iii. 17.

As the only way of escaping the danger, he tells us that we should "TAKE HEED to the sure word of prophecy—the prophecy which holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and that he wrote especially—That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior.

Now there is no difficulty at all in determining the application of this prophecy to the "false teachers," when this strongest feature of their "damnable heresies—even denying the Lord that bought them"—is the subject in question. All are agreed that it belongs to those who deny him, i. e., what the word of God declares of him, in his nature and attributes, and what must also follow, in his offices and institutions.

But when Peter gives us the very words which the "scof-

fers" shall use, and we hear men using these very words, can we hesitate about the application of *this* portion of his prophecy? especially when we see them practising the very things also which Peter ascribes to them—in "speaking great swelling words of vanity," and "wresting the scriptures?"

You will say that "these our champions are professed ministers of Christ—these are great men, and good men." Very well. We may be pardoned even if we should feel as little interest for their reputation as for our own. They should have thought of that before they put the question at issue in its present form. They must make the best of it. And let it be remembered, that none but professed ministers of Christ could fulfil the prediction. A man must *appear* to be true in order to be false.

Again, none but "great men," in the popular sense, could fulfil the prediction. The false prophets were generally *great* men. They usually had the king and court, the Ahab's, and the Jezebel's, on their side, while the true prophet was left to complain, "I am left alone!" And of these "false teachers" it is said, "*MANY shall follow their pernicious ways.*" They of course must be *great* men.

As to their being "good men" God calls them "scoffers," "the wicked," &c., and we dare not call them anything else.

Have we any of this class among the anti-advent champions? They shall speak for themselves. What is it to "wrest the scriptures?" To wrest is to "twist by violence," "to distort." Now if we can show that they violently "distort" "the scriptures," to make them favor their "heresies," the case is perfectly plain. And that view of the Savior's words, which turns them into nonsense, or makes him contradict himself, must be a distorted view.

Turn we then to the application of his word, as recorded, Matt., xxiv., by the anti-advent writers. The "coming of the Son of Man," here predicted, is interpreted by them to mean, *the providential interposition which effected the destruction of Jerusalem.* Now Christ says, ver. 23, referring particularly to that event, "Then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not." He then goes on to say that "his coming" would not take place until "after the tribulation of those days," verses 29, 30, which, whatever it might comprehend besides, certainly comprehended the destruction of Jerusalem.—While Luke places

his "coming" after their fall by the edge of the sword, and their being led away captive into all nations, and the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles is fulfilled. Luke xxi. 24. 27.

Now did Christ mean to say that Jerusalem should be destroyed "after" it was destroyed? Nay, "after" it was trodden under foot of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled?" Did he predict that the Son of Man would come *at that time*, and then warn us, "If any man should say he was there, *at that time*, to believe it *not*?" Let those who will, ascribe to him such mockery and contradiction, and thus "wrest the scriptures to their own destruction." We dare not.

Again, the same prophecy is interpreted to refer to "the event of death." So the apostles never understood the language. When Christ addressed these words to Peter, alluding to John, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Then went this saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple *should not die*," John xxi. 22, 23. Mark the interpretation: *If John tarries till Christ comes, John cannot die!* It settles the question forever, that *they* could not associate the idea of death with the coming of Christ.

But to return to Matt. xxiv. Did the apostles mean to ask Christ for a "sign" of their death? And did Christ tell them in reply, that they would be deceived if they expected to find *death* "in the *desert*," or "in the *secret chambers*?" We cannot think so. And again we repeat, let those who can ascribe such trifling and nonsense to Christ, do it; and thus prove to all that they are "led" and leading "away with the error of the wicked."

Again, this and similar prophecies are interpreted to refer to what is called "the *spiritual* coming of Christ." To say nothing here of the absurdity of supposing that Christ is ever said to *come*, in a sense in which he was never *absent*, we would again ask, Did the apostles require a "sign" of his coming *spiritually*? and did Christ, in reply, tell them that they would be deceived if they expected to find him *spiritually* "in the secret chambers," or "in the desert?" No, no, brethren. As certainly as "the Bible means what it says," those who thus "wrest the scriptures," by turning the words of Christ into nonsense, are "the wicked"—"the false teachers," and "the scheme of interpretation" which demands it is, and we have no doubt has prov-

ed to be, in a thousand cases, a "damnable heresy." In all these prophecies of "the coming of the Son Man," the personal presence of Christ is, and must be understood, if we allow that there was any rational connection between the question of the Apostles and the answer of Christ, or between the different parts of the answer itself.

But do we hear any of these champions use the language which Peter ascribes to the "scoffers, saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" No sentiments, no words are more familiar with them.

Professor Stuart, to whom we have referred so often, argues and insists that "*all the prophecies respecting the appearance of the Messiah was invested with the costume of figurative language,*" and are to be interpreted "*spiritually,*" He speaks as follows of the promises under consideration.

"Christ himself assumed a visible appearance then, (at his first coming) only that he might take on him our nature and die for sin—Heb. ii. 9, 14. When he appears a second time, there is no necessity of assuming such a nature; he will appear, i. e. he will give manifest tokens of his presence, only for the purpose of salvation—salvation *spiritual*, not temporal; Heb. ix. 28."

It looks a little like the boldness of the scoffers to deny that this promise speaks of the *personal* and visible coming of Christ. The Universalists accuse the anti-adventists of using their arguments, and in this case we have the proof.

The regard he entertains for those who believe in the personal coming of the Lord may be seen from this allusion to "early opinions."

"Papias, whom Eusebius thinks to be somewhat *shallow*, seems to have been a pretty full believer in the *visible* coming and kingdom of Christ."

He appears to feel no other sentiment for the doctrine than that of contempt.

Professor Bush, who disagrees with Professor S., in the *times* of prophecy, is quite as much at fault, in the *events* of prophecy. "The visible and personal second coming of Christ—the resurrection of the righteous dead," &c., are to him only "*a happy delusion.*" Others have spoken of the world going on for "Millions of ages;" but what need to look for proof when we cannot go amiss of it?

The promise of the Lord's coming is flatly denied, or look-



ed upon with doubt and contempt, by the most prominent opposers of our position.

And, finally, it is their great work, to allure those that were clean escaped from them that live in error, away from the prophecies to their "heresies," with their great swelling words of vanity, in flat contradiction to the command of the apostle. Nothing is more common than to hear them speaking right out against the study of the prophecies. "Let the prophecies alone." "Let Daniel alone, and you will do well enough." "Remain quiet," &c. &c.

If these anti-advent champions are not then the ones to whom Peter refers, though others to whom we have not particularly alluded, may also be comprehended, his words can have no meaning. In the name and by the authority of the word of God, we charge it upon them, and God himself, we solemnly believe, will shortly charge it upon them in a form which they will understand.

In the name of all the "dignities" in heaven, and all that have been on earth, of whom "they are not ashamed to speak evil," and whom we should hardly feel prepared to meet, without denouncing such profanity, we protest that their scheme of interpretation cannot be the true interpretation of the prophecies of God.

And now, brethren, a word more, and we have done with you. We have spoken freely, and for obvious reasons. On you is laid the responsibility of determining the character of the crisis which has come. Though we are nothing, the truth and the God of truth are everything. Whether time continues for a longer or shorter period, everything that is to be hoped or feared, so far as this case is concerned, is to be the result of your treatment of the truth and its disciples.

The persecutors of the early Christians scandalized them as "the common haters of mankind," while the multitude who counted them as sheep for the slaughter, were so ignorant of the Christian faith, that they could give no reason for treating them as they did. When Nero set Rome on fire, he had only to implicate the Christians, in order to divert the storm, which should have gathered around his own brow, down upon them. But the day of vengeance came for Rome, and when it came, Providence found agents equal to the work of filling to her double the cup she had filled to them.

In a similar manner we have been scandalized by our most distinguished opponents, while the multitude have responded

to the scandal. They too have desolated, to no small extent, some of the fairest portions of the church of God, by bringing his word "into contempt," and have charged upon us the desecration. So far as men can do it, you must decide who are the guilty. God helping us, *we are ready!* And Heaven knows, and you know, there are Vandal hearts and hands enough in the moral wastes around you to rally at, and interpret for themselves, the old Roman battle-cry "*Carthage must be destroyed!*"

If, then, it is only possible that we are believers of the truth of God in this case, beware how you silence, or repel and persecute away from his altar, those whom God has appointed you to protect, and which, if you fail to do it, your protection cannot be of sufficient interest to him, to call forth a thought to save you.

And why should we be treated thus? Are we not Christians? are we not Americans? are we not your brethren? We can trace our pedigree to fountains which have supplied their part of the blood which was shed in the struggle that gave us our so-called free pulpits and altars and presses. The fruit of our labors in the service of God, now make up, in part, the membership of your churches. And yet we are slandered by all these instrumentalities, so that our "children in the gospel," and our common countrymen, nay, even our own relatives, are taught to regard us as the enemies of all that is holy on earth or in heaven! It is a truly sublime and alarming, though necessary position, into which every man is brought, when he is laid under the necessity of being honest and humble enough before God, to acknowledge the claims of his truth, or base enough to deny them. At that moment his character and fate are decided by the turn which his own hand must give the scale! "*He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life shall find it.*" Brethren, you now occupy that position!

A word to the other class of the church, and we are done. With the Johns and the Marys we have had but little difficulty. Unlike Peter, they rarely become "bold" and impious theorizers; and never would they think of rejecting a plain promise of God, because it held out the prospect of a personal interview with their Lord. They would rather feel afraid it was too good to be true, and "believe it not for joy."

They may not exhibit the most commanding development of the understanding, and of course they may err, but their

love never fails to preserve the integrity of the heart. It may err in its manifestations, as we know it did when they would "embalm" the body of the Savior, which was to see no corruption, although they had been so often told that he would "rise again the third day." And that error, it should be remembered, called forth the severest reproof they ever received from the Savior's lips: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe *all that the prophets have spoken!*" But point out their errors, and they will always "rejoice in the truth."

It would be no wonder, since the false prophets who were to appear, should well nigh "deceive the very elect," if some of this class should be found under the influence of their "heresies." Indeed, one feature of their imposture is well adapted to deceive them. They are generally spiritually minded. The enjoyment of the Spirit is their chief consolation while absent from Christ.

Now these false teachers have given so many of the promises, which speak of Christ and his kingdom literally, a *spiritual* reference, that this spiritual meaning, as it is called, is all they think of, although Paul has plainly told us that the Spirit is only "the earnest" of the glorious reality.

"Yes," I hear them say, "that is just what we believe;" we have "the earnest" now, and when we die we expect the full glory of the "heavenly inheritance."

Very well. Do not lightly esteem "the earnest." We have no hope without that. But if the apostle is right, "the inheritance" is to be given to us, not when we die, but "*at the appearing of Jesus Christ.*"

Again you reply, "If we are to have a *heavenly* inheritance, must it not be *in heaven?*"

All that is made perfectly plain by "what is written." Abraham looked for, and is to receive "a heavenly country." If we ever possess the inheritance, it will be with Abraham. We shall "sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of God." And when we inherit that kingdom "we shall bear the image of the Lord from heaven."—"And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incor-

ruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal, immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."—1 Cor. xv. 49—54.

Again, this kingdom is to be "set up *by the God of heaven*"—it is to "fill the whole earth, and stand forever;" and his will shall be done in it "*as it is done in heaven.*" Conformed in our bodies to the image of our *heavenly* Lord, in the society of those who do the will of God as it is done *in heaven*, and inheriting a kingdom set up by the *God of heaven*! Surely this must be a *heavenly inheritance*.

We know our great opposers tell you that the kingdom of God is only spiritual, and refer you to the words of Christ, "The kingdom of God is within you,"—Luke xvii. 20, 21; and, "My kingdom is not of this world."—John xviii. 36. (See Hints, 2d ed., p. 181.) But you know better, brethren, than to suppose that Christ meant to tell *the Pharisees*, to whom he spake, that the kingdom of God was within them. He evidently meant to tell them, as they were looking for a kingdom with "*outward show*," that the only form in which the kingdom of God then existed, (and it will exist in no other till Christ comes in his glory,) was "in the midst" of, or "among" them. As if he had said, "Here is the king, and here are the subjects, despised and suffering. If you wish to share in the glory of the kingdom '*when it shall appear*,' you must share in the suffering." For this the Pharisees of that day, like those of our own, were not prepared, and the Savior let no opportunity pass to remind them of it.

In the other case an important part of the text is omitted, which we will give as it is. "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: *but now is my kingdom not from hence.*" It amounted to this: "True. *I am a king*; at least, that is *the end for which I was born*. But I do not receive my kingdom, like the kings of this world, by *fighting*; therefore my servants cannot fight for me against my enemies. Moreover, the time has not *now* come for me to receive my kingdom." He himself has told us that he must "go into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, (the kingdom is given him by the Ancient of days, Dan. vii. 13, 14,) and to return."

Then he will destroy his enemies ; "and the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom and possess it forever."

We know you love the Savior, brethren, and would rejoice to enter upon the inheritance. We know, too, that your sympathies have been with us. You have been grieved that our opposers should take the position they have, and that Peter and his brethren should remain like dumb dogs, all the while, and especially, that they should unceremoniously silence and speak of us with reproach, when they should have treated us, at least, with some of that "charity" which they have exercised towards our revilers. But the test has been too severe. You could not trust yourselves to judge in a case where you must condemn those to whom you had been accustomed to look with reverence, or admit that we might, after all, be guilty of heresy, and worthy of stripes. You saw that the churches were "disturbed," and as your brethren charged it upon us, you tried to think it was right.

**True.** We have made disturbance, but is it a new thing that a belief in the promises of God should make disturbance? and will you blame us without blaming the people of God at other times?

**Why** was there such a disturbance in Egypt, in the days of Moses, which, we might suppose, from the commemoration of it by the Psalmist, shook even her colossal statues, and mountain pyramids, as well as her brick-kilns, and prisons, and palaces, and idols, and priests, and philosophers, and princes?—"What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest? thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back? Ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams, and ye little hills, like lambs?" This simple truth explains the whole. "*The time of the promise*" had come, "*and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, and God looked upon the children of Israel,*" and had interposed for their deliverance.

**And** why was there a similar disturbance in Babylon in the days of Cyrus? Because it was "understood by books that *the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem, were ended. And the captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, they return with singing into Zion.*" Why was there such a disturbance in Bethlehem when "*there came wise men from the east, saying, Where is he that is born king of the Jews?*" What should set Simeon to "*blessing God,*" and Anna to

"*giving thanks*," and others with the angels to rejoicing, while "*Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him?*" And if we could speak to the real Mary and John, we would ask the latter why "*he did outrun Peter*," as they hastened to the sepulchre? and why they were all so "*glad to see the Lord*."

In all these cases *the promise of God* was at the bottom of the disturbance, and we most solemnly believe, (and now more than ever, since our most able adversaries have not only failed to show wherein we are mistaken, but have been compelled to take a more unauthorized and absurd position, than was ever done by the enemies of the truth before,) that all that is promised to the people of God should now be expected every moment!

And is it in man, is it in you, brethren, is it the will of God, that we should be unaffected?

Jesus has died for us, and risen again, and gone to prepare a place for us, in the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man. He has promised to return again and take us to himself, that where he is we may be also. And then the tabernacle of God shall be with men. There our eyes shall see the King in his beauty — they shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle which shall not be taken down; for the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be the Lord's, and he shall reign forever and ever. And why should we not be glad to see him? especially when we are here but pilgrims and strangers, with no continuing city or abiding place?

With some of us, too, it is as it was with Abraham. We have been called to *bury our dead*, the light of our eyes and joy of our heart, *out of our sight*. Lover and friend are put far from us. Like Rachel, our *children* are not, and we can hardly be comforted. Or, like Martha and Mary, we have to complain, "our brother is dead." And the promise in reference to them is, these shall come again to their own border. Thy brother shall live again. We consigned them to the grave in sorrow, though in hope; and can we look with indifference to the hour which swallows up death in victory, and gives them back to us to die no more?

Some of us are afflicted. Days of pining and wearisome nights are appointed us, and we are assured by the promise of God, that, at the appearing of Jesus Christ, the "weakness" shall give place to "power" — that we shall be equal

to the angels of God! And can such a glorious change be thought of without emotion?

Some of us are poor, and though our enemies complain of us, as Pharaoh did of the children of Israel, "Ye are idle, ye are idle," the little we obtain to meet our necessities, which we would receive with all thankfulness, is the result of incessant care and toil. And we are assured that there remaineth a rest for the people of God in the world to come, over which our King and Savior is the appointed heir of all things. And when he sits upon the throne of his glory we trust he will say to us, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And is it possible that such heirs of such a kingdom can remain silent, as they are about to enter upon its possession?

Some of us are dependant upon, or in subjection to, our fellow-men, yes, even slaves; and their demands upon us, righteous or unrighteous, must be met, or insult and stripes, as their mercy may dictate, must follow. And how can we, though we have the first fruits of the Spirit, but groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption which shall deliver us from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God?

Here is our crime. Faith in these promises has made all the *disturbance* in the churches. Brethren, if it be such a crime in us to be moved in view of such a prospect, and to call upon our fellow-men to prepare for a part in these glorious promises, in the estimation of those who have shown that "they know not the Scriptures nor the power of God," can you condemn us? We wish to believe nothing but "what is written," and we have always been anxious that our brethren should point out our mistake. But we appeal to you, in the fear of God, have they done it? Have they not confessed that the long established principles of interpretation are in our favor? have they given us any thing better? Nay, have not their champions attempted to impose upon the church a scheme of interpretation which is at once a scandal upon her profession, and a reflection upon her God? Have they not taken the position of the "false teachers," and the "scoffers" of "the last times?"

Can you, then, join with them in assuming that the belief of the promises of God is in itself proof that we are "insane" or "influenced by the devil?" Will you, too, trample us in the dust, and then despise us for being there? Well,

if it must be so, our labors will be the greater, and our release the more welcome. But we beg of you, and warn you to pause and consider !

Our confession, our position, and our apology, are now before the world. To God we commit ourselves and the cause, praying, that his mercy, without which we are all undone, may be exercised towards our enemies before the hour of coming wrath.

BOSTON, MAY, 1844.

---

## ARTICLE II.

### *The Rise and Progress of Adventism.*

THE earliest distinct enunciation of the fundamental doctrine of ADVENTISM, of which we have any account, was by Enoch, that holy man, the seventh from Adam. He prophesied of these, saying, "*Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.*"—Jude, 14, 15.

From that period onward, until the canon of scripture was closed up, the doctrine has been held and repeated, with more or less distinctness, according as the circumstances of the writer or speaker demanded. That such a doctrine as that advanced by Enoch, has always been an object of hope to the people of God, none can doubt if they will carefully read the word of God ; that the Old Testament abounds with allusions to, and promises of such a glorious consummation of our fondest hopes, can be easily seen by a careful perusal of those sacred pages. But much more do the words of Christ, together with the preaching and writings of the apostles, bring life and immortality to light through the gospel. It is in this constellation that the coming of the Lord shines forth, the brightest gem of heaven's galaxy.

No shadowy fable of coming glory in this world of sin, to the despised followers of a despised and rejected Savior, ever



flitted before the minds of those devoted men, who, at the command of that Savior, went forth into all the world to carry the message of mercy to every creature:—for they went with the full assurance of rejection, scorn, hate, persecution, tribulation, and even death, awaiting them in the path they trod. No trophies of victory dazzled in their vision, kingly sceptre or imperial crown never shone before them, until “through much tribulation they should enter the kingdom of God.” Then, when all the toil is over, the last victory of the spiritual church gained, and the whole family in heaven and earth united and perfected in one, before the throne of God; then comes the fruition of their fondest hope, “Sit down with me on my throne, even as I have overcome and am set down with my Father on his throne.” “When the Son of Man shall come in his glory,” he will say to those on his right hand, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, and INHERIT (precious word) the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” It was this hope, the hope of a better resurrection, that gave fortitude to the martyrs at the stake, in the lion’s den, on the rack, under stripes, in cold, damp, dark dungeons, and amidst the loss of all things. Hence, it entered into all their thoughts and plans. The apostles preach no sermon, make no speech, write no letter, unless they “comfort one another” or warn their foes, “with these words.”

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS AND MILLENISTS, is,—The ADVENTISTS believe in a pre-millennial and personal advent of Christ from heaven, to glorify his saints and to take vengeance on his foes. While the MILLENISTS believe in the universal spiritual reign of Christ a thousand years, before his second personal advent.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS AND MILLENNARIANS, is,—The MILLENNARIANS believe in the pre-millennial advent of Christ, and his personal reign for a thousand years before the consummation or end of the present world, and creation of the new heavens and earth, and the descent of the New JERUSALEM. While the ADVENTISTS believe the end of the world or age, the destruction of the wicked, the dissolution of the earth, the renovation of nature, and the descent of the New Jerusalem, will be at the beginning of the thousand years. *The Millennarians* believe in the return of the Jews, as such, either before, at, or after the advent of Christ, to Palestine, to possess that land a thousand

years, while the *Adventists* believe that all the return of the Jews to that country, will be the return of all the pious Jews who have ever lived, to the inheritance of the new earth, in their resurrection state. Then *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, with all their *natural seed* who have been of the faith of Abraham, together with all *pious Gentiles*, will stand up together, to enjoy an *eternal* inheritance, instead of possessing Canaan for a thousand years.

THE MILLENNARIANS believe a part of the heathen world will be left on the earth, to multiply and increase, during the one thousand years, and to be converted and governed by the glorified saints during that period; while the *Adventists* believe that when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, then he shall be seated on the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them the one from the other, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. He shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on his left. That one part will go away into everlasting (eternal) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. They cannot see any probation for any nation, either Jew or Gentile, after the Son of Man comes in his glory, and takes out his own saints from among all nations. They also believe "God will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men."

The *Millennarians* believe that the saints must have mortal men in a state of probation, for a thousand years, as their subjects, in order for them to reign as kings; for, say they, how can they reign without subjects? To which the *Adventists* reply, If it is necessary for them to have such subjects for a thousand years in order to reign, by the same rule they must have them *eternally*; for "THEY SHALL REIGN FOREVER AND EVER." Rev. xxii. 5. And again, it is replied, Adam had dominion given him, but not a dominion over man. It was a "dominion over all the earth," and all its creatures. So also the kingdom Christ will give to the saints when he comes in his glory, is "the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Just the dominion which Adam had, will belong to the saints.

These are some of the leading points of difference between the *Millennarians* of Europe and America, and the *Adventists*, whose history we now write.

It will not, of course, be expected of us in a work like the present, to enter into detail on these points of difference. They can be found in the writings of the advocates of the respective theories. The design of the present history is, to present to the reader a true and faithful account of the rise and progress

#### OF ADVENTISM.

This system, of which William Miller may be considered the father, and with whom it was original, so far as he knew at the time of his embracing it, except as he found it in the word of God, had been held and advocated in substance by others, both in Europe and America. This is especially true respecting his interpretation of the prophetic periods, and the time of their termination. The grand principle involved in the interpretation of the 2300 days of Daniel viii. 14, is, that the 70 weeks of Daniel ix. 24 are the first 490 days of the 2300, of the 8th chapter. This principle had been developed during the last century by Hans Wood, Esq., of Rossmead, Ireland, from whom the argument was quoted by the learned Dr. Hales, and republished by him several times within a few years of the close of the last and commencement of the present century.

The same principle was adopted by E. Erving, Joseph Wolfe, and the greater portion of the English literalists, with the exception, that they carried the time forward to 1847, while Mr. Miller ended it in 1843.

Several persons in this country, within the present century, by an independent reading of the Scriptures, discovered the very same principle. Some of them published it to the world, but without succeeding in making much of an impression upon the public by their attempt. Nor did this subject of time ever gain much attention in this country, until after Mr. Miller had labored for a number of years, almost incessantly, in its propagation.

The manner in which he was led to the discovery of his system was thus related by himself in a public lecture :

“ In the month of May, 1816, I was brought under conviction ; and O, what horror filled my soul ! I forgot to eat. The heavens appeared like brass, and the earth like iron. Thus I continued till October, when God opened my eyes ; and O, my soul, what a Savior I discovered Jesus to be ! My sins fell like a burden from my soul : and then how plain the Bible seemed to me ; it all spoke of Jesus, he was in every page and every line.

O, that was a happy day, I wanted to go right home to heaven ; Jesus was all to me, and I thought I could make everybody else see him as I saw him, but I was mistaken.

" During the twelve years I was a deist, I read all the histories I could find ; but now I loved the Bible. It taught of Jesus ! But still there was a good deal of the Bible that was dark to me. In 1818 or 19, while conversing with a friend to whom I made a visit, and who had known me and had heard me talk while I was a deist, he inquired in rather a significant manner, ' What do you think of this text, and that,' referring to the old texts I objected to while a deist. I understood what he was about, and replied,—' If you will give me time I will tell you what they mean.' ' How long time do you want ?' ' I don't know, but I will tell you,' I replied, for I could not believe that God had given a revelation that could not be understood. I then resolved to study my Bible, believing I could find out what the Holy Spirit meant. But as soon as I had formed this resolution the thought came to me, ' Suppose you find a passage that you cannot understand, what will you do ?' This mode of studying the Bible then came to my mind.—' *I will take the words of such passages and trace them through the Bible, and find out their meaning in this way.*' I had Cruden's Concordance, which I think is the best in the world, so I took that and my Bible, and set down to my desk, and read nothing else except the newspapers a little, for I was determined to know what my Bible meant. I began at Genesis and read on slowly ; and when I came to a text that I could not understand, I searched through the Bible to find out what it meant. After I had gone through the Bible in this way, O, how bright and glorious the truth appeared. I found what I have been preaching to you. I was satisfied that the seven times terminated in 1843. Then I came to the 2300 days ; they brought me to the same conclusion ; but I had no thought of finding out when the Savior was coming, and I could not believe it ; but the light struck me so forcibly I did not know what to do. Now, I thought, *I must put on spurs and breeching ; I will not go faster than the Bible, and I will not fall behind it.* Whatever the Bible teaches I will hold on to it."

It was by such a study of the Scriptures, comparing scripture with scripture, and tracing subjects by the aid of his Concordance, instead of turning to and depending on the decisions of commentaries, however learned, that William Miller became a man mighty in the scriptures, and was qualified to bring forth from that sacred store-house, things new and old. It is by his assisting and encouraging others to pursue the same course, he has been the instrument of pouring a flood of Biblical knowledge upon Christendom, such as no other man has done in the same length of time, since the days of Luther, if, indeed, since the apostolic age.

Thousands there are who can say, in truth, that after years of study of the most learned commentators, from a perusal of Mr. Miller's course of lectures on the Second Coming of Christ, they have obtained a clearer view of the gospel plan, and have discovered more beauty and harmony in the Bible, than from all the books they ever read beside. Of his worth

and service as a public teacher, we need not write, for it is already known and read; and thousands will rise up in the great day, to call him blessed. Although we write neither the history or eulogy of Mr. Miller, yet we deem it due to him, and more especially to the honor of God's glorious grace, to acknowledge his infinite wisdom and goodness in the selection of such a man for such a work; so that no man should glory in his presence:—a man of powerful native intellect; capable of achieving the greatest objects;—of the most undoubted probity in his moral and Christian character, so that among all the foolish and wicked things said, both by professor and profane, yet not one spot has been found on his reputation, by which the cause of God could be reproached. A man of extensive reading and general intelligence, yet with little of the learning of the schools. Such a man God made his chosen instrument to bring forth this great truth, that no flesh should glory in his presence.

Concerning his personal appearance and private character, we must do the reader the service of giving him the following portrait, drawn by a delicate pencil:—

“I have just had the privilege of meeting with this humble servant of God, at the fire-side of a friend, and I can truly say that my earnest expectations were more than realized in the interview. There is a kindness of soul, simplicity, and power, peculiarly original, combined in his manner, and he is affable and attentive to all, without any affectation of superiority. He is of about medium stature, a little corpulent, and in temperament a mixture of sanguine and nervous. His intellectual developments are unusually full, and we see in his head, great benevolence and firmness, united with a lack of self-esteem. He is also wanting in marvellousness, and is NATURALLY sceptical. His countenance is full and round, and much like the engraving we have seen, while there is a peculiar depth of expression in his blue eye, of shrewdness and love. Although about sixty-two years of age, his hair is not grey, but of a light glossy auburn, his voice is full and distinct, and his pronunciation somewhat northern-antique. In his social relations, he is gentle and affectionate, and insures the esteem of all with whom he mingles. In giving this charcoal sketch to the public, I have merely sought to correct numerous mis-statements, and gratify the honest desire of many distant believers, with a faint outline of the character and appearance of the man, whom God has chosen to give the ‘Midnight Cry’ to a sleeping world.”—*Midnight Cry*.

The writer cannot do justice to his own sentiments and feelings on this subject without saying, that for the last six years it has been his highest earthly pleasure to suffer reproach, with such a man in such a cause. *And now, on THIS 24TH DAY OF APRIL, IN A. D. 1844*, when all the prophetic

periods given in the Bible have gone by, so far as we are able to calculate them; and while the world scorn, and professors scoff, if there is one enviable position on earth, it is the position such a man occupies in the eyes of all intelligent beings; the possession and enjoyment of a sweet consciousness of having, in a degenerate and recreant age, dared to brave the storm of public contempt and ridicule, and proclaim to a wicked world an unwelcome truth.

The rise of the Advent *cause*, as it has been developed by Mr. Miller, may be dated in A. D. 1831. For although he discovered his principles as early as 1818, it was not until 1831 that he first began to publish them abroad.

His first step in this work, was the publication of a series of articles on the subject of Christ's second coming, which appeared in the *Vermont Telegraph*, a Baptist paper, published in Brandon, Vt. Those articles were written to rid himself of the strong impression which followed him, that he must go and publish this thing to the world.

But after writing and publishing the above, instead, as he expected, of finding relief from his responsibilities, he only found the inward monitor the more earnestly pressing him, saying, "Go and tell it to the world, or their blood will I require at thy hand." To rid himself of this strong impression, he wrote a synopsis of his views, and in the spring of 1832, he published it in pamphlet form, and spread it over the country, and sent it to different parts of the world among the missionary stations.

This, however, was no more availing, as a relief to his mind, than the former. At length, after a long resistance, he consented in his own mind, if the Lord would open the way, that he would go out and attempt to speak on the subject. This was suddenly followed by an invitation from a friend in a neighboring town, to come and talk to them on the second coming of Christ, and the offer of the Baptist meeting-house in that place for the purpose. This was a proposition he little expected, and for the moment he shrunk from the task. At length, calling to remembrance his promise, he went and began his work. The Lord was with him to bless his word, and souls were saved through the effort.

From that, the way opened in various places, where the same results followed, as the fruit of his labor.

He continued to travel and lecture, as the Lord opened the way, for about six years, with few if any to take him by

the hand and encourage him on in his great and arduous work. Until 1838, although there were several ministers of the gospel, who, under the influence of his lectures, were convinced that he was correct in his system of interpretation, yet had not the courage to declare themselves advocates of the doctrine. With one exception, (Elder Fuller, now gone to his rest) all the ministers who embraced the view previous to 1838, relapsed and abandoned its advocacy. The current of public opinion was too strong for them to stem it successfully.

PUBLICATION OF MR. MILLER'S EIGHTEEN LECTURES.

In 1836, Mr. Miller found a friend who undertook the publication of a volume of lectures, the series which he usually gave as a course. The publication of those lectures constituted a new era in the history of the Advent cause; for, from that time, wherever he went and lectured, the written lectures which were left behind continued to preach, and establish those who were partially convinced of the truth. His labor, by this means, ceased to be like writing upon the sand, as formerly. It is one of those strongly marked demonstrations, which history presents, of the power and influence of the press, for good or evil.

Those books gradually spread abroad, where he had never been in person, and created an interest in the public mind to investigate the subject for themselves. It was not, however, until the winter of 1837—8, that the work attracted much attention in Massachusetts. About the month of February, in 1838, several copies of the lectures found their way into Massachusetts, and awakened quite a sensation. One copy fell into the hands of the editor of the *Boston Daily Times*, and most of the lectures were republished in that paper, and obtained quite an extensive reading. The effect was so great that it was found necessary to provide an antidote, in the shape of two letters from the pen of Rev. Ethan Smith. His great argument was predicated on the assumption that the 2300 days of Daniel viii. 14, ended in 1819, when an entering wedge to the Greek revolution began to operate, and has resulted in the fall of the Ottoman power; thus the sanctuary was cleansed. To make out this to be the true termination of the 2300 days, he denied that the little horn of Daniel viii., was Rome, and applied it to Mahomedanism. Then

(unlike Rev. Mr. Shimeall) he denied the connection between the 2300 days and the 70 weeks. For he clearly saw that if the 9th of Daniel was an explanation of the 8th, that the little horn of the 8th must be Rome, and not Mahomet; for the simple reason, that the people of the prince who came after Messiah was cut off, and did destroy the city and sanctuary, were the Romans.

It is a great marvel, truly, that such a man as Mr. Shimeall should not see that, if he admitted such a connection to exist between the two chapters, he must apply the desolator of the 9th chapter as he does the 8th. Mr. Smith saw this, and avoided the dilemma by separating the two chapters. This ebullition soon passed away without putting down the doctrine.

About the time of the appearance of those lectures in the *Boston Times*, a copy of the work was put into the hands of the present writer, with a request that he should read it, and give his opinion of its merits. The idea of an attempt to discover the time of Christ's Second Advent, was to him so strange, that he could scarcely make up his mind to give the book a perusal. No doubt came into his mind but what he could entirely overthrow the whole system in five minutes. For, thought he, according to Paul, 2 Thessalonians ii., the falling away must first come, and the Man of sin be revealed; which the great body of commentators understood to be the papal system. But, according to Daniel and John, that power is to continue for 1260 days, or years; and the date assumed by the most learned writers of the age, for the commencement of the period, was 606, and consequently it would not end until 1866. This was a decisive argument. However, to gratify a friend, and from a curiosity to know what arguments could be adduced in support of so novel a doctrine, the book was read. There was no difficulty in adopting most of the sentiments advanced in the first lecture. Prejudice began to give way, and the idea of the glorious reign of Christ *on the earth renewed*, was most delightful. From that, the 1260 days came up, and the evidence presented, by which it was clearly shown that those days terminated in 1798, having begun in 538. The great argument against the coming of the Lord, which had appeared so strong and invulnerable, soon vanished; and a new face shone forth from Paul's argument. The substance of it was, the predicted period having gone by, and the papacy having been con-



sumed away by the spirit of the Lord's mouth, he is next to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. Then there can be no Millennium until Christ comes:—for the reign of the Man of sin, and a glorious Millennium cannot co-exist. Thus the old fabled Millennium was lost.

Before concluding the book, I became fully satisfied that the arguments were so clear, so simple, and withal so scriptural, that it was impossible to disprove the position which Mr. Miller had endeavored to establish.

The question of duty then presented itself thus:—"If this doctrine is true, ought you not, as a minister of the gospel, to understand and proclaim it?" Yes, certainly, I had. "Then why not do so?" Why, if it should, after all, prove false, where will my reputation be? And, besides, if it is not true, it will bring the Bible into disrepute, after the time has gone by. But there is another view to be taken of this subject. How shall we know whether it is true or false? Can it be known except by the testimony of the Scriptures? What do they teach? This is the true question. If it is true that the Lord is coming so soon, the world should know it: if it is not true, it should be discussed, and the error exposed. I believe the Bible teaches the doctrine; and while I believe thus, it is my duty to make it known to the extent of my power. It is a scriptural subject, and one full of interest; and the discussion of it cannot do harm. These prophecies and periods are in the Bible, and mean something:—if they do not mean this, what do they mean? Thus I reasoned, until the Lord, in a night dream, showed me my own vileness, and made me willing to bear reproach for Christ, when I resolved, at any cost, to present the truth on this subject.

As soon as this decision was formed, I began immediately to write and publish a series of letters, embodying a synopsis of Mr. Miller's views, which was published in Lowell, Massachusetts, in a 12mo. pamphlet of 48 pages, entitled "*THE MIDNIGHT CRY, or a Review of Mr. Miller's Lectures on the Second Coming of Christ, about A. D. 1843.*" This pamphlet was circulated to some considerable extent, through New England, and awakened a permanent interest in many minds. Many of whom are now our strongest friends. This effort, although weak in itself, was owned of the Lord, and made the instrument of saving souls. In addition to this pamphlet, I began also to preach the doctrine wherever I

went. This was at a time when there was not another minister known in New England, who advocated the views, except — BROTHER CHARLES FITCH, pastor of the Marlboro' Church Chapel, Boston. He also had obtained the loan of a book, and became impressed with the truth of the arguments. He prepared two sermons on the subject, giving an outline of the arguments, and preached them to his congregation. This produced, as might be expected, quite a sensation in the community. The church were offended, and his ministerial brethren treated the whole thing with so much contempt and ridicule, that he lost his confidence in the system, and relapsed again into his former views of a millennium before Christ's coming.

Thus I was still alone, as an advocate of the doctrine. But nothing daunted by the report that Mr. Fitch had given it up, I commenced, in April, the preparation of another work, at the same time continuing to lecture wherever the way opened. In that second work, I gave my own, rather than the views of Mr. Miller, as in the first pamphlet. The second book was a volume of 204 pages, entitled, "*The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ about A. D. 1843,*" &c. This was given to the public in June, 1838. In the preface to the work, the author thus expresses himself; and at this juncture it may not be amiss to transcribe the sentiment:—

"All pretensions to a spirit of prophecy, or to infallibility of the interpretation of prophecy, are utterly disclaimed. It has often been asked,—If the event does not come out as you believe, what will you think? Will it not destroy your confidence in the Bible? To this it is replied, Not at all; the writer has, in the course of his research on this subject, seen so much which has been literally fulfilled as predicted, that although all he has written on this subject, should prove to have been founded in ignorance, he cannot doubt but that the prophecies have a meaning, and that they were written by direction and influence of the unerring Spirit of the Holy One, and will, in due time, be fulfilled. But at the same time, he must be permitted to express his firm conviction, that these calculations are founded in truth, and will stand the ordeal they must very soon pass—the unerring test of time."

Such were the writer's sentiments then, and such they still remain.

It was in this work the calculation on the fall of Ottoman supremacy on the 11th of August, 1840, was first given to the world. So, also, the argument on the 1260 days, showing how all the events which were to precede the time, times and

a half, centered in 538, while the decree of Justinian was given in 533.

This work circulated through New England, and excited something of an interest. The subject rested here, with the exception of a few newspaper articles published in *Zion's Herald*, of Boston, and *Zion's Watchman*, of New York, until the spring of 1839.

MR. MILLER IN MASSACHUSETTS—PUBLICATIONS, ETC.

In that year, Mr. Miller was invited into Massachusetts to lecture. In that tour, he visited and lectured in Randolph, Lowell, Groton, and Lynn. His introduction was principally through the influence of Elder T. Cole, of Lowell, a minister of the Christian connection. Again, in the autumn and winter of the same year, he returned and lectured in Exeter, New Hampshire, and Haverhill, Massachusetts, where a good effect was produced.

It was at this Exeter meeting that he first became acquainted with Elder J. V. Himes, and received his first invitation to visit Boston, and give a course of lectures in the Chardon Street Chapel. His first course of lectures in that place constituted altogether a new era in the history of ADVENTISM. An excitement was produced in Boston, which demanded light, and prepared the public mind to sustain the enterprise of hiring the Marlboro' Chapel for a course of lectures. From that point an influence was extended through all the adjacent country; and such was the demand for light, that it was determined to issue a new and revised edition of the lectures. This work was undertaken, without fee or reward, by that devoted friend of this cause. He cheerfully undertook the revision of the work and the superintendence of publication, which a Boston publisher agreed to do, if he could have the profits arising from the edition of five thousand copies. This he had. Mr. Miller has often been blamed for securing the copy-right:—and hence it is but justice to him and the cause to say, that it was the only condition on which the publisher would undertake to issue the work. After selling the five thousand copies, Mr. Mussey, the publisher, concluded that the demand was over. For the purpose of supplying the public, Mr. Himes then undertook, at the earnest solicitation and advice of friends, the publication of the work himself. At the same time he abandoned the copy-right, and thus, to

save reproach on the cause, exposed himself to the competition of any and all who chose to compete with him. The same course has been pursued in reference to all his other publications. Notwithstanding all this, all that the tongue of slander could invent, has been heaped upon him, for the stand he took and the self-denying course he pursued on this subject.

During Mr. Miller's lectures in Boston, a work entitled *Illustrations of Prophecy*, by *David Campbell*, appeared, designed, like Mr. Smith's production above named, to overthrow Miller's system. The ground taken by Mr. Campbell was, in some respects, like Mr. Smith's in the model; the latter was adopted for the frame-work of the book. But Mr. Campbell, with the same inconsistency of which Mr. Shimeall is guilty, contends, first, that the little horn spoken of in Daniel viii. was Mahomedism; and then adopted the ninth chapter as a key to the eighth. How blind must be that mind which does not see, that if the ninth chapter does explain the eighth, then the final desolation of the sanctuary spoken of in the eighth is the same as that in the ninth, and is, as Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton have both proved, Rome, and not Mahomedism. But the effect of Mr. Campbell's work, like that of his prototype, was only to retard for a moment what it could not stop.

Some other works of an ephemeral character, from Orthodox, Infidel, Universalist, and other *ists*, appeared about the same time, and accomplished each their work, by overthrowing—not Mr. Miller, but one another.

Under these repeated attacks from the pulpit and press, it was felt that some organ of communication should be opened, by which the public mind could be disabused in reference to the varied reports which were circulated in reference to Mr. Miller and his views. He had long sought for some one to take the supervision of a paper through which he could speak to the public; but such a man could not be found, who for love or money would undertake the task, and bear the scorn of an unbelieving world.

At this juncture, when the storm of opposition grew heavy, the providence of God raised up a man for this work also. That unwearied friend of this cause, J. V. Himes, who has so nobly stood in the front of the hosts and the hottest of the fire, came forward and threw himself into the enterprise, to make up the breach. On the 20th of March, 1840, without money,

patrons, or scarcely friends, he issued the first number of the "SIGNS OF THE TIMES." The appearance of that sheet was hailed with joy, by many a longing heart, waiting for the consolation of Israel. The paper was sustained for the first year at a considerable expense to the editor, besides his own unrequited toil. As might be expected, the enemies of the cause were greatly discommoded by the appearance of such a weapon, both offensive and defensive. Nothing which a heart surcharged with gall, could invent, or the tongue of envy utter, was left unsaid or unwritten against the editor. But his language was, None of these things move me. He was sufficiently convinced of the truth of the doctrine to know that it was worthy, at least, of a full and candid investigation, and this he determined it should have, so far as he was able to gain thus much for it.

The paper thus started, was published for two years as a semi-monthly, and, since then, as a weekly periodical. It has been read by multitudes throughout the United States, and in the British provinces, with the deepest interest; and has been to thousands an angel of mercy and love; the good it has accomplished will only be known in the great day of the Lord.

During the same winter, 1839—40, Mr. Miller was invited to lecture in Portsmouth, N. Hampshire, and Portland, Me. In both these places, as well as in Boston and vicinity, his labors were attended with refreshing showers of divine grace. Numbers embraced the doctrine of the Lord's speedy coming, who are yet strong in faith, giving glory to God. This winter's campaign produced an excitement throughout New England, and raised up friends in almost every town.

As the spring opened, and the summer came, the entire community were excited, and expectation on tiptoe, in reference to the 11th of August and its anticipated events, the fall of the Ottoman empire, &c. &c. Many were the predictions that when that day should have passed by, as it certainly would do, without the event being realized, that then the spell would be broken, and Adventism would die. But the time came; and it must be confessed it was for a few weeks a time of trial to many. Yet "He who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb," had compassion on his little ones and did not suffer them to be tempted above what they were able to bear. And few, very few, even under that trial, shrunk from their faith. The time came and passed by; and, as a matter of

course, the distance from Constantinople could not be passed without consuming some considerable period of time. But when the fact did reach us, it was found that on the very day anticipated, the 11th of August, a transfer was made of the supremacy of that empire from Mahomedan hands. This fact entirely discomfited the hosts of the enemy. The cause again revived, and careered on its way with still greater power than ever before.

#### UNITED EFFORT.

Up to this period all that had been done was accomplished by individual effort. In this depression of affairs, it was determined to hold a "SECOND ADVENT CONFERENCE" in Boston, where the friends of the cause could congregate and give expression to their feelings, and put forth an effort to arouse the country and the world to a sense of its coming doom. This meeting was assembled in the Chardon Street Chapel, on the 15th of October, 1840, and continued two days.

This was styled "THE FIRST GENERAL CONFERENCE OF SECOND ADVENT BELIEVERS."

It was a season of comfort and refreshing to the lovers of the glorious appearing of our blessed Lord. The organization of the meeting was the most simple that could be devised. Mr. H. D. Ward was called to the chair, and Henry Jones, of New York, was appointed secretary of the meeting. No further organization was thought necessary. The report of the doings of the Conference were published in an 18mo pamphlet, together with the lectures which were delivered on the occasion. These were widely circulated through the community, by the friends of the cause, with the happiest results.

At this Conference the idea of commencing social meetings among Adventists, for the purpose of strengthening each other's faith, was suggested. The plan was adopted in many places, and resulted in great good to the cause, and those who enjoyed them.

#### MR. DOWLING'S BOOK.

It was in this year, 1840, that Rev. John Dowling, a Baptist clergyman of Providence, Rhode Island, published his far-famed Review of Miller, in which he has adopted all those wild chimeras, so long since exploded. That Antiochus Epi-

phanes, a Syrian king, is the hero of Daniel's vision, 8th chapter ; and that the 2300 days are but half days, amounting to 1150 literal days ; which he shew were literally fulfilled by Antiochus within about 55 days.

Or, in other words, the vision of the ram, the he-goat with his great horn, his four horns, and the little horn which came afterward, in the latter time of their kingdom, were all fulfilled in just three years. He also maintained the old fabled doctrine of a thousand years' millennium, before the coming of the Lord, the return of the Jews to Palestine, &c. &c.

To this production Mr. Miller wrote a brief reply, which was published and extensively circulated. The work was more fully reviewed by J. Litch, and the *Refutation* published in pamphlet form.

It was this work which first suggested to Mr. Miller the idea of searching the Bible to find a true system of Bible Chronology ; and resulted in what has since been given to the world ; showing that the six thousand years from the creation end about A. D. 1843. Although there may still be reason to doubt the exact correctness of that chronology, yet it is clear that it cannot be far from correct. The influence of Mr. Dowling's book has been various ; on some minds, those, especially, who do not wish the Lord to come, it has operated as a quietus. Others it has induced to examine the subject more fully, and brought them to the conclusion that the Advent doctrine is correct. The book and its principles, foolish and idle as they are, has been quoted and adopted by many opponents, clearly because they could get nothing better with which to oppose us.

In the Spring of 1840, the writer of this article wrote and published a third work, entitled "*An Address to the Clergy.*" It embraced in a short compass an exposition of the nature of the kingdom of God ; also an article on the return of the Jews, and their title to the land promised to Abraham for an everlasting possession. It presented the subject in a light somewhat different from what it had ever been presented before in this country. The effect of it on the clergy was considerable ; some were moved by it to give the subject an examination, and became satisfied that it was the true position. It also contained the argument on the fall of the Ottoman empire. The second edition, published in 1841, was revised by giving the historical facts, showing the fulfillment of the calculation.

In the spring of 1841 it became a question with the writer, whether he could, consistently with his belief in the speedy coming of the Lord, retain his ecclesiastical relation with the Methodist Episcopal Church, as an itinerant minister. The many strong ties by which he was bound to that church of his early choice, were hard to be severed. With her ministers he had been on terms of sweetest friendship, with her institutions he felt the strongest sympathy; and then, again, the feelings and welfare of a beloved family were presented to his mind, as an insuperable barrier in the way of being exclusively devoted to the work of proclaiming the Lord's coming. Then, on the other hand, a firm persuasion that the doctrine was true, and a conviction that it was high time the church and world were aroused to their danger, pressed upon him until they overcame, and he concluded to throw himself upon the providence of God, and go forth. It was an unbeaten way;—not one minister of the gospel was then devoted exclusively to the cause, excepting Mr. Miller. But, hard as it was, he has never yet had cause to regret the step.

The example has had its influence on other brethren, whose ties have been equally strong and binding; yet they have cut loose and thrust in their sickle to reap in this harvest-field; and rich has been the precious fruit which has been gathered in. After dissolving my relation to the *travelling connection* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, my first step was to attend the Second General Conference of Advent believers, which was held in Lowell, June 15, 16, 17, 1841.

This Conference was a time of deep interest, and gave a new impulse to the cause. At the time of holding both these conferences, Mr. Miller was sick and unable to attend. The report of this meeting, with the lectures delivered, was also published in pamphlet form, and widely circulated. At this meeting we also had quite a company of ministers of various denominations, who were obedient to the faith, so far as to attend the conference and identify themselves with us.

But perhaps the course of things, during the ensuing summer, cannot be better told than by inserting the following, which appeared in "*The Signs of the Times*," Vol. 2:—

SCOWHEGAN, ME., JULY 24, 1841.

"DEAR BROTHER HIMES:—Having a leisure hour, I embrace it to give you a brief account of my recent tours and visits to the seats of the four New England Methodist Episcopal Annual Conferences. The first was



my own Conference, the Providence, the session of which was held in the city of Providence, commencing June 9th, 1841. This Conference was set off from the New England Conference at the last General Conference, and met for the first time in their separate capacity.

I shall not however enter into subjects of general interest, in reference to these bodies, but confine myself, principally, to the state of our cause and its prospects. In Providence, during the Conference, I gave several lectures on the second coming and kingdom of Christ, in the Christian Chapel, which was kindly offered for the purpose. The congregations were not large, but attentive, intelligent, and interested. Several of the members of the Conference were present at each lecture. Among the citizens of Providence we have some ardent friends of the cause, beside many warm opposers. Mr. Dowling has unquestionably exerted a paralyzing influence on the public mind in that city; and I fear many, very many, through his influence, will be lulled to sleep in sin, and go down to ruin.

Among the Preachers of the Conference, so far as I could learn, there is an increased interest felt in reference to the subject. Several, who a year ago were either indifferent or entirely and openly opposed to the discussion of the subject, I found to be deeply interested in it. Some entirely, others partially, convinced of the correctness of our doctrine. While there are several others whose prejudices have so far subsided as to be willing to hear and read on the subject, although they think it *hardly* worth while to trouble their heads with new theories. On the whole, my conviction is, that there is quite generally a strong conviction rising in the minds of the Preachers that the old doctrine of the world's conversion, the restoration of Israel, and Christ's spiritual reign for a thousand years, is built on human tradition, and not on God's Word.

But the most interesting part of the narrative is yet to come. As it was to this Conference I was amenable for the doctrines I taught, as a matter of course the strange things I have been spreading before the community for some time past, came up before the Conference for examination. My respected Presiding Elder, under whose supervision I labored during the last year, said he had nothing against Brother Litch, but he believed he preached the Miller doctrine, and he felt it his duty to bring it up, as some of the brethren wished to know how it was. The Bishop said, Brother Litch would tell us how that was.

*Litch.* I shall be happy to answer any questions brethren wish to propose.

*Bishop.* They say, brother Litch, you preach the Miller doctrine; how is it?

*L.* If brethren will define their meaning, I can perhaps answer their questions.

*B.* They want to know whether you teach the Miller doctrine.

*L.* Well, if they will define themselves, I will try to tell them. This I confess to you, brethren, that after the way some call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, and have hope toward God, which they also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.

*B.* That is not it; they want to know whether you believe, with Mr. Miller, that the end of the world will come in 1843?

*L.* I can answer that question. I believe and teach in common with Mr. Miller and others, that God has, by his servant Daniel the prophet, revealed the events of time in a long connected series, from the days of Daniel to the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven to receive an

universal, everlasting kingdom under the whole heaven. That with those events certain prophetic periods were connected; and that most of those events and part of those periods have already been fulfilled; also that the remainder will be accomplished in 1843.

*B.* Do you think that is Methodism?

*L.* I do. At least it is not contrary to the articles of religion of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Various other questions were asked by the Bishop and different brethren, embracing nearly every point peculiar to Miller's theory, occupying from thirty to forty-five minutes. The best of feelings were preserved throughout the whole scene, and a deep melting solemn sensation pervaded the Conference. After deliberation on the question, the Conference came to the conclusion, that I held to nothing contrary to Methodism, although I went in some points beyond it. They then, at my own request, granted me a location, and thus left me at liberty to devote my whole time to the dissemination of this important subject; and if it is hereby, they have taken a measure of the responsibility of it. The influence of that examination, there is good reason to believe, was most salutary, and afforded a most valuable opportunity of bringing the subject before those who before knew little or nothing of it.

It was not, however, without strong feeling, I came to the conclusion to dissolve my connection with the itinerant ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with whom I had labored in sweetest fellowship for eight years of my life, and from whom I have received unremitted evidence of regard and kindness. Nothing but a solemn conviction of duty to God and my fellow-men, to throw my entire influence into the enterprise in which we are engaged, could have induced me to take the step. And it is due to my brethren of the Providence Conference to say, that after my location nothing but the strongest assurances of regard and esteem and confidence came from any one of them, together with their best wishes for my future welfare and success. All which they may rest assured is heartily reciprocated.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE CONFERENCE.

This Conference commenced its session at Dover, New Hampshire, June 23. Through the kindness of the friends, the Freewill Baptist meeting-house was secured for lectures, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday evenings. Monday and Tuesday evenings the Calvinist Baptist house was generously offered. The congregations were good each evening. Quite a number of preachers were present at each lecture, and the subject seemed to make quite a deep impression upon their minds. There are several members of this Conference, also, who think, feel, and talk much upon the coming of the Lord at hand. My intercourse with brethren was pleasant, and reception among them cordial. After distributing about ten dollars' worth of books among the members of the Conference, on the 30th of June, I left for Worcester, the seat of the

#### NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE.

Here I found myself at home, in the midst of old friends and tried brethren. Brother Elihu Ellis having secured Brinley Hall for the purpose, I gave a course of lectures in that place. The lectures, all things considered, were well attended, and the effect, I think, will not be lost.

Probably there are fewer preachers in this Conference who feel an interest in this great question, than in either of the other Conferences in New England. But still there are a few who are disposed to give it

attention and examine its merits. I distributed gratuitously, in the Conference and town, about fifteen dollars' worth of books and publications on the Second Advent. Thus the seed is sown, and it is hoped some of it will yet spring up and bring forth much fruit. Let it be watered by the fervent prayers of all who love the appearing of the Savior.

#### MAINE CONFERENCE.

This Conference met in this thriving village on the 21st inst. It consists of about one hundred and thirty members. I arrived by stage on Wednesday evening, and was cordially greeted by my acquaintance in this Conference. They were anxious to have some lectures during my stay among them, to which I of course assented, if they would procure a place for them. Application was accordingly made to the committee of appointment to supply the desk during the Conference. They were very jealous of such heresy, and declined granting the request. The subject was finally carried into the Conference for the decision of the question. The effect was like a fire-brand in a magazine of powder. A warm discussion, for about thirty or forty minutes, ensued, which drew out both friends and foes of the cause, and probably excited more interest than could have been raised by a half dozen lectures without that previous movement. The question was finally disposed of by laying it on the table, by thirty-one to thirty, on the ground that it was not expedient for the Conference to take any action on the subject; but that the question of opening the house or not, was entirely with the Committee. The Baptist minister, however, very readily granted the use of his meeting-house for a lecture, which was held last evening. The discussion in the Conference had awakened an interest in the preachers to hear for themselves on the great question; and, accordingly, at the appointed hour, there came out, I should judge, something like two thirds of the Conference, and a good number of the citizens. During the lecture, it was easy to be perceived, an interest in the subject, never before felt, by many, was waking up, and long-cherished prejudices were giving way.

To-day, I have sent into the Conference, for gratuitous distribution, about thirty dollars' worth of publications on the second coming and kingdom of the Savior. The eagerness with which they were seized evinces the determination of those ambassadors of Christ to know more on the subject before they vote upon it again. On the whole, we have more to hope, so far as I can learn and judge, from Maine, than any other portion of the New England States; and the seed sown on that fertile soil will not all be lost. There are, in this Conference, a goodly number who are already hearty advocates of the doctrine, and others who are almost persuaded. And I have the assurance of many, who have hitherto stood aloof from it, that they shall give it a thorough investigation, and satisfy themselves.

Your fellow laborer and brother in Christ Jesus,

J. LITCH.

The course of Adventism was steadily onward, both among clergy and laity, throughout New England.

It was in the autumn of this year that that devoted and beloved brother, C. Fitch, returned again to the examination of the question of the Lord's coming, and came out a decided advocate of the doctrine. He at once entered the field, and has proved an efficient auxiliary to the cause; and the Lord will reward him in that day.

Brother Wm. Miller continued his labors in various parts of the country, with great success. Brother Himes, also, devoted as much time as his pastoral and other duties would allow, to lecturing on this subject.

In October, another Conference was held in Portland, Me., which gave a new impulse to the work in that section of the country.

Another Conference was appointed and held in the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City, which was the first successful effort ever made in that city.

In most of these Conferences, we were greatly aided in our work by the active co-operation of our beloved brethren, H. D. Ward and H. Jones. Notwithstanding their strong objections to any attempt at fixing a date for the termination of the prophetic times, yet they generously yielded their objections to co-operate with us in this work of sounding the alarm.

From *New York City*, we proceeded to *Low Hampton*, the residence of Brother Miller, and commenced another Conference. It was a season of refreshing to all, and more especially to Brother Miller himself. It was the first Conference he had ever attended; and to find around him such a host as were congregated there, from east, west, north and south, from Canada, as well as the States, raised up to proclaim this truth, by the blessing of God on his labors, was to him most refreshing and encouraging.

From *Low Hampton* the writer returned to *Newark*, *New Jersey*, and began a series of lectures there, and continued them each night, for three weeks. The Lord owned his word and blest it to the good of many souls. A goodly band were there raised up, many of whom are yet strong in faith, and looking for the Savior's coming.

From there, by invitation of Brother J. J. Porter, he visited *Philadelphia*, and spent three weeks in sowing seed which he expects to reap after a few days. This was the first introduction of Adventism beyond *New York*. After three days' labor, a few souls in *Philadelphia* embraced the doctrine, who, with few exceptions, hold it fast to the present time.

During the winter of 1841—2, Conferences were held in various places, which were all attended with good. *Boston, Massachusetts*; *Dover, New Hampshire*; *Sandy Hill, New York*; *Pomfret, Connecticut*; *Colchester, Vermont*; *Ashburnham and Lunenburg, Massachusetts*, &c. The result

of them, eternity will unfold ; but much fruit was immediately apparent. A large number of ministers of the gospel were awakened, during the winter, to a sense of their duty to investigate the subject, and were induced to preach it more or less in their public ministrations ; and some of them devoted themselves entirely to the Advent cause, and became efficient lecturers.

#### ADVENTISM ESTABLISHED IN NEW YORK CITY.

As the spring opened, Brother Himes determined on sounding the cry abroad more fully in the city of New York ; and, accordingly, in the month of May, himself with Brother Miller, went to that city to commence their operations. The Apollo Hall, on Broadway, was rented at a heavy expense, and they commenced their work. The labors of the preceding visit were so far obliterated that none could be found to invite them to their house and give them a night's lodging. They, accordingly, took an ante-room adjoining the hall as a sitting and lodging room for a part of the time, until friends were awakened and brought in, who furnished a cot-bed, and thus relieved them from the hard floor. Two weeks, under these circumstances, laboring night and day, paying most of their own expenses, (for the public collections were very small) were necessary before an impression could be made. One fact should be here recorded:—An impression had gone abroad in reference to the Adventists, that they were monsters, or almost anything but civilized beings. So strong was this impression, and so general, that a number of days had passed and scarcely a lady dared to make her appearance in the meetings. The religious press had sounded the alarm, and spread a panic through the community which it was difficult to remove. But as one after another ventured to look in, and then to listen, the prejudice began to give way, and the congregation to enlarge, and before the meetings closed on anniversary week, the house was well filled with attentive hearers, and a permanent interest secured. It was a great undertaking, but the victory was at length achieved, and a great and glorious harvest has been gathered in. This meeting closed under encouraging circumstances, and filled all who were present with hope as to the future.

## CAMP-MEETING ERA.

While the meetings were progressing in New York, the friends in Boston determined on a general rally in that city during anniversary week. Accordingly, the Melodeon was secured for the occasion, and our meetings began under the most auspicious circumstances. Adventism had never seen a brighter day. The attendance was large throughout the entire meeting. Although the interests of the week were great, yet none had a larger share of attention than the Advent anniversary Conference. During that week, among the various other interests which came up for discussion, was the question of holding a camp-meeting or camp-meetings during the ensuing summer. This was thought, by many, a great undertaking. What, a little handful of Adventists hold a camp-meeting! Why, they are hardly able to hold a house-meeting, much less a camp-meeting! However, there was sufficient faith and zeal in the meeting, to say "TRY." Arrangements were accordingly made by the appointment of a camp-meeting committee, to carry the plan into effect. It was determined to make a most vigorous effort during the summer, for the spread of this great light. For we then thought it doubtful whether we ever should reach another anniversary week, in time.

Immediately after the anniversary meetings were over, the writer started for Canada East, to fulfil an engagement in Stanstead. He left Boston on Monday morning, and arrived at Stanstead, and began his meeting on Wednesday. The interest steadily increased from the beginning, and before two weeks were passed, the country, for thirty or forty miles around, was awake to the subject of the Lord's coming. Immense concourses assembled, both in Canada and in Derby, Vermont, where a course of lectures was given. Such was the interest to hear, and the awakening among the people, that it was determined at once to hold a camp-meeting in Canada. In accordance with this determination, a place was selected, the ground prepared, and the meeting held in the township of Hadley, Canada East. Such was the good effect of this first meeting, that the people of Bolton wished one to be held in their town. This was begun the next week after the Hadley meeting closed, and ended on the third of July. During that month's labor, as near as could be estimated, five or six hundred souls were converted to God.

The last week in June, the first Advent camp-meeting held in the States, commenced in East Kingston, New Hampshire, where an immense multitude assembled to hear the word of the kingdom, and worship the God of Abraham. Thus, instead of one Advent camp-meeting during the season, which the unbelief of some thought could hardly be carried through, within one month of the determination to "*try*," three such meetings had actually been successful. Besides these camp-meetings, there were immense gatherings of the people all through the northern part of Vermont and New Hampshire, and onward through the state of Maine. It was a movement which shook the nation.

#### THE GREAT TENT.

While these operations were going forward, the plan was started for constructing a large tent sufficient to accommodate four thousand persons, with which to go into the cities where no house was open for lectures. This proposition was at once received by the people, and Brother Himes, with the help of other friends, undertook the work. Such a tent was completed and pitched in Concord, New Hampshire, in the latter part of July. The excitement produced by such a movement was still greater than that occasioned by the Advent camp-meetings.

The tent was next pitched in Albany, New York. Then in Springfield, and Salem, Massachusetts, and Benson, Vermont. And finally, for the last time in the season, in Newark, New Jersey. In all these places the word took effect and produced the greatest and most beneficial results. Besides the great tent-meetings and numerous courses of lectures, there were held some six or eight camp-meetings, in New England, during the summer and fall. The work spread with a power unparalleled in the history of religious excitements. And had it been the object of Adventists to form a sect, never was there a more favorable opportunity to carry all before them, given to any people. But higher and holier objects were in their vision;—the saving of sinners from death, and the obtaining a preparation for the coming of the Lord, were the objects of their highest ambition.

During the season, Brother C. Fitch made a visit to Oberlin-Institute, where he proclaimed the doctrine of the Lord's coming to the students, as well as faculty of the institution,

and in various other places in Ohio. While on this tour, the Lord wonderfully blest his labors, and gave him favor in the sight of the people. It was arranged for him to remove his family into that region of country, to spend the winter, and lecture in Cleaveland and vicinity. This movement awakened an interest in that part of the country, which has been increasing to the present time.

#### OPERATIONS DURING THE WINTER OF 1842—3.

After the close of the Newark camp or tent-meeting, the cold weather set in and rendered it impracticable longer to continue these public out-door meetings, and the laborers began to arrange for a winter's campaign. Brother Himes, together with Brother Miller and others, returned to New York, and commenced a course of lectures, in the church corner of Catharine and Madison Streets, where Brother Storrs had been laboring with great success for a number of weeks. The interest still continued to increase beyond all expectation. An invitation was also given for a course of lectures in the Methodist Protestant Church, in Anthony Street, under the pastoral care of Brother E. Jacobs. This invitation was accepted by Brother A. Hale, and attended with a great blessing. Brother Jacobs, and many of his church, embraced the doctrine, and began immediately to proclaim it with great power.

#### THE "MIDNIGHT CRY" COMMENCED.

Such was the interest in New York City, that it was determined, by Brother J. V. Himes, to commence a daily Advent paper, and publish it at least for four weeks, in which the principal arguments sustaining our views were to be embodied and given to the public in a cheap and popular form. The paper was commenced in the latter part of November, 1842, entitled "*The Midnight Cry*." It was principally under the editorial supervision of our beloved and faithful brother, N. Southard. The twenty-four numbers were published, and ten thousand copies of each number circulated. Most of these were gratuitously distributed through the post offices at the expense of the publisher. Of course, such a distribution could not fail to awaken an interest throughout the country, of the most salutary character. Thousands were enlightened and instructed, and embraced the doctrine, who never heard



a lecture on the subject. The "Cry" has been continued as a weekly paper up to the present time, and has each successive week been extending its sphere of usefulness, and cheering the hearts of thousands of lonely pilgrims, in every part of the land.

After the Newark tent-meeting, the writer made another visit to Philadelphia, where he, in connection with Brother A. Hale, who soon joined him, through the influence of Brother J. W. Dyer and wife, found an open door and access to the people. After a short time, however, the churches were all closed against us, and we were obliged to open a separate meeting or give up the enterprise. The friends interested in the cause came forward and secured a place for our meetings, which we commenced in the latter part of December, 1842, under the most encouraging circumstances.

The beginning of January brought with it openings in the country, which were accepted; and the Lord blessed the labor to the good of many precious souls. The labors of Brother Hale, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and vicinity, during the month of January, 1843, will be remembered by the people of that part of the country while thought or being last.

In January, 1843, a tract was prepared, containing an outline of the whole subject, and translated into the German language; some thousands of which have been circulated among the German population of the country. In February, 1843, Brother Miller and Brother Himes visited Philadelphia, and gave a course of lectures, with very great effect. The city was convulsed throughout with the influence of the lectures. Saints rejoiced, the wicked trembled, backsliders quaked, and the word of the Lord ran and was glorified. It is doubtful whether Mr. Miller ever gave a course of lectures with greater effect than at that time. It placed the cause on a permanent foundation in the city, and prepared the way for extending it into the south and west. A book-room was opened in the city early in January, and a small penny paper, the Philadelphia Alarm, was issued. Thirteen numbers of it were published, about four thousand copies per number.

About the same time, two brethren started on a southern tour; they proceeded as far as Richmond, Virginia, but finding it impracticable to do any thing there, they returned to Philadelphia; where one of them, Brother E. Hale, Jr., determined on returning again as far as the District of Columbia, in connection with the writer, and make another trial there.

We were accompanied by brethren T. Drake, and J. J. Porter. We succeeded in obtaining a hearing in the Methodist Protestant Church, at the Navy Yard, in Washington. The Lord blest the word, and souls were saved. Brother Porter, after leaving Washington, made yet another effort to go into Virginia, which also failed. Indeed, it seemed as though some fatal spell had fastened on the south, that it could not be approached. The writer, in connection with E. Hale, Jr., left Washington on the 5th of March for the west, and proceeded as far as Pittsburgh. The Lord opened the way in that city, so that, in the course of a week, there was a very general inquiry awakened on the subject, and a number of churches were opened for lectures. So, also, in the vicinity around the city. Indeed, the whole West seemed ripe and ready for harvest. Letters written from Pittsburgh, and published in the *Midnight Cry*, soon aroused the friends at the east, and a number of lecturers immediately started for that field of labor. The Advent banner was unfurled in Cincinnati, and from thence the light has been spreading all over the western and southern country.

Returning from Pittsburgh, about the middle of March, the "Philadelphia Alarm" was discontinued, or rather merged in the "*Trumpet of Alarm*," a paper containing the diagrams of the visions of Daniel and John, and a connected view of the Advent doctrine, gotten up for the express purpose of circulating in the west and south. From twenty-five to thirty thousand copies of it have been circulated.

While these things were going on at the west, the Lord was still at work in the east. By his gracious Providence, those beloved brethren, N. N. Whiting, J. B. Cook, and F. G. Brown, were brought into the faith, and began to proclaim it aloud. The effect of it was electrical. Very many, who had previously looked upon the subject as beneath their notice, began to feel that it was possible, after all, that there might be something in it. This induced examination of the evidence, and that again produced conviction of the truth of the doctrine.

In a manner too rapid to record, the Advent cause went forward during that winter. I am aware that history loses more than half its interest from the absence of its details; but such are the limits to which this sketch must be confined, it is impossible to enter into the minutia of the thing. All that can be done, will be to record the outlines of the story.

Then, again, Brother Fitch's mission in Ohio resulted in the establishment of a Second Advent paper in Cleaveland, which has proved an instrument of great good to the cause in that section of the country.

Brethren H. B. Skinner and L. Caldwell, who spent the winter in Canada East, also commenced a paper there, devoted to the cause. But I must hasten to record the crisis.

#### THE CRISIS—ITS EFFECT.

All the calculations of prophetic time were understood to end in 1843. What time, in that year, was a matter of uncertainty. Some supposed one point of time, some another. It was Mr. Miller's opinion that the 70 weeks ended with the crucifixion, in A. D. 33 ; consequently, the whole time would end with its anniversary, in 1843. But he was not satisfied as to the exactness of the calculation, and hence, from the outset, expressed himself "about 1843." The writer well recollects a conversation he had with Mr. Miller on the subject in 1839, when he remarked, that he was not of the opinion that it would transpire in the Spring of 1843 ; he thought our faith would be tried ; and added, I shall claim the whole Jewish year, until March 21st, 1844, for my time. It is due to Brother Miller to make this statement, because it has been said so frequently that he has changed the time. It is not so. True, he never publicly defined what he called 1843, until the winter of the year commenced, and so many fixed on its earlier parts as the terminus, that it became necessary to do so, in order to clear himself of their positions and responsibilities.

#### FEBRUARY—THE TAKING OF ROME.

The earliest date fixed upon by any of the Adventists as a probable time for the Lord's coming, was February 10th, forty-five years from the time the French army took Rome, in 1798. The next point, and the one which was thought the most probable, was the 15th of February, the anniversary of the abolition of the papal government, and the erection of the Roman Republic. Viewing this to be the termination of the 1290 days of Daniel xii. 11, they believed 45 years more would terminate the 1335 days of verse 12.

Accordingly, expectation with many was on tip-toe, fully

believing that the great day of the Lord would then break upon the world. Nor were such anticipations entirely without reason. The event which had marked that day, forty-five years previously, was of such a character as to warrant such an expectation. So far from condemning those who thus looked and expected the coming of the Lord, they are rather to be commended. Better, far better, to expect him, and be disappointed a thousand times, than to have him come in an unexpected and unprepared moment. 'Twas greatly wise, therefore, to expect and be prepared for the event, at the earliest possible point, where there was a probability of the ending of the periods.

Those periods came and passed with no unusual occurrence. As soon as they had gone by, a flood of scoffing, reviling and persecution burst forth, not from the infidel world, so much, but from the professed friends of the Savior; the most idle and foolish stories of ascension robes, and going out into the grave yards to watch, going to the tops of houses, &c., &c.; these were repeated again and again, both from pulpit and press, until the public were, many of them at least, almost persuaded to believe them true.

How, or where they originated, except in wilful falsehood, we cannot devise. Some of the reports of that character, we happen to know, originated with professed ministers of the gospel, who gave date and place, when there was not a word of truth in the whole story. Others must have originated in a similar way.

The effect of this disappointment on the believers in the Lord's coming, instead of shaking their confidence in the truth of the Bible, or the doctrine of Christ's speedy appearing, rather settled them in the belief, and rendered them less effervescent, but more confirmed and disposed patiently to watch. Few, if any, were so much shaken by the passing of that time, as to go back and give up the doctrine.

#### SECOND POINT—THE FOURTEENTH OF APRIL.

The 15th of February past, the next epoch which presented itself as a leading point of time, was the Passover, the season of the year in which the crucifixion took place. This was looked upon by many as being a strongly marked era,—  
1. Because it was on that occasion God delivered his people from Egypt, 430 years from Abraham's sojourn. 2. Because

on that feast our blessed Savior was crucified, and, as many believed, ended the 70 weeks of Daniel ix. 24. Hence, they argued, the 2300 days must terminate when the same feast arrives in 1843, and the Savior will come.

"And why," it is asked, "was not that reasoning sound, if your premises are correct, viz., that the 70 weeks are the first 490 years of the 2300?"

The answer is,—1. It has never been proved that the crucifixion of Christ just finished the 70 weeks. On the contrary, Dan. ix. 27 gives us a strong intimation, nay, more than an intimation, a strong assertion, that in the *midst* of the week, within its limits, he should cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. And the last event of the 70 weeks, as enumerated in verse 24, was the anointing of the "*Most Holy*," or the "*Holy of Holies*," or the "*Sanctum Sanctorum*." Not that which was on earth, made with hands, but the true tabernacle, heaven itself, into which Christ, our high priest, is for us entered. Christ was to do in the true tabernacle, in heaven, what Moses and Aaron did in its pattern. See Hebrews vi. vii. viii. ix. And Exodus xxx. 22—30. Also, Leviticus viii. 10—15. The anointing of the Holy of Holies in the tabernacle on earth, immediately preceded the presentation of the sin-offering before the mercy seat. Of course, Christ, our High Priest, must go within the veil before he could fulfil the type. This he did not do before his ascension.

2. It has not been proved that the cleansing of the sanctuary, which was to take place at the end of the 2300 days, was the coming of Christ or the purification of the earth. The marginal reading is, "then shall the sanctuary be JUSTIFIED." And this term should always be kept in mind, and is the true word; perfectly harmonizing with the whole tenor of Scripture. But this subject will be discussed in another work, and does not belong to this place. It will be sufficient to say, here, that facts, which have been in a course of fulfilment since last May, have afforded good evidence that the calculation of the 2300 days was correct, assuming the ascension of our Lord as the end of the 70 weeks. \*

---

\* It should be here stated, that there are many Adventists who do not agree with Br. Litch that the 2300 days might have ended "last May;" i. e., 1843. While they look upon the "facts" to which he refers, as of a very interesting character, they cannot believe these are the facts which are to take place "at the end of the days,"—"the time appointed" when "the end shall be."—EDS.

The 14th of April was a point of time anticipated with the deepest solicitude by many. They had the fullest confidence that it would not pass without bringing the expected crisis. When it passed away, however, instead of sinking down in discouragement, the friends of the cause held fast their integrity, as a general thing, and continued to carry on the work with greater zeal than ever. Others looked forward to the season of the Ascension or Feast of Pentecost as being the most likely time for the Advent; and they, too, were disappointed. At this juncture, the enemies of Adventism supposed there would be a very general giving up of the faith. But in this they were as greatly disappointed as the Adventists were in not seeing the Savior in his glory.

The month of May came and brought with it the celebration of the great religious, moral and philanthropic anniversaries, in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston. Among the rest of the hosts, appeared the Adventists. These anniversaries were fully attended, both by lecturers and friends of the cause generally. The occasions were of deep interest, and gave a new impulse to the work.

The momentary reaction which resulted from the passing away of the month of May, was counterbalanced, and the brethren started on their summer tours with new zeal and courage. The door was everywhere open before them, so that, notwithstanding the laborers had greatly multiplied, yet one half the calls for light could not be met and supplied.

As the summer opened, preparations were made for tabernacle and camp-meetings. East, west, and north, they were appointed and held; most of which were attended with the special blessing of God on the people, and greatly extended the knowledge of the Advent views. Nor did the presentation of the subject lose any of its power from the fact of the disappointment in respect to time. The same deep anxiety to hear on the subject, which has characterized the doctrine from its beginning, marked it still. Not only in places where it had gained a foothold, but in new places where it had never been proclaimed, the greatest anxiety to hear was manifested.

Brother Himes undertook the task of again sustaining *the great tent*, and going with it into western New York. This he, in connection with other brethren, carried through. Up to that time, no permanent interest had been created in that part of the country. But from the holding of the tent meetings in Rochester and Buffalo, the subject took a strong hold

on the community through that region of country, and has been steadily going forward ever since.

From Buffalo, the tent was taken to Cincinnati, Ohio, and a full exhibition of the Advent doctrines given to the people. Several courses of lectures, however, had been previously delivered in that city, and the people were thus prepared to improve the privilege of the tent lectures. There had also been several camp-meetings in the vicinity of the city; so that a great interest prevailed in the country to obtain light on the subject.

In connection with each of the tent-meetings, an Advent paper was published, in which the main points of the Advent doctrine were given to the people, with great effect.

Another attempt was made, in the spring and summer, to carry the doctrine more fully into the south, by brethren Storrs and Brown. The former went to Norfolk, Virginia, in the month of May, but could get no hearing at all. The latter visited Washington city, Richmond, Virginia, and Norfolk, in June and July. In the first and last named places he gained a hearing; but at Richmond no opportunity presented itself for a lecture. But little interest, however, was awakened at that time; and Brother Brown's health failing him, he was obliged to abandon the enterprise. Another effort was made by two brethren from Philadelphia, in the lower part of Delaware and eastern shore of Maryland, with good success.

As the autumnal equinox approached, the expectations of many were raised, that the Lord would come at the season of the Feast of Tabernacles. But that occasion passed by with no particular change; so that some took occasion to say, "every vision faileth, the days are prolonged." But the steadfastness of the faith of such as were looking for the Lord, showed that they had not believed the doctrine without investigation. They had made up their minds that the history of the world (as one brother expressed it,) was not to turn round and go back again. They well understood that the prophetic history is filled up. There cannot be a long delay before the everlasting kingdom of God will come. Few, very few, were discouraged by the passing away of time.

We have not space for a full account of the numerous incidents which marked the labors of the summer and autumn of 1843. But it must be recorded, to the praise of God's glorious grace, that the work of the Lord went steadily forward, bearing down all opposition, from whatever source.

We were deprived, during the entire spring and summer, of the labors of our beloved Brother Miller, who was confined to his house, by a painful sickness, for a number of months. In the fall of the year, as his health improved, he again commenced his arduous work ; first making a tour through New England, and then into western New York. During the eight weeks which he spent in the latter tour, he preached eighty-five times, besides all the other duties which devolved upon him, incidental to such a journey. Never were his labors attended with better results, or received with greater pleasure, than during that journey. "The good seed," "the word of the kingdom," still found good ground, into which it fell, took root, and brought forth fruit.

During this visit to the west, among other places, he visited Lockport, New York, the residence of Elder E. Galusha, so well known in the Baptist church in the United States. He had been for several months more or less exercised on the subject of the coming of the Lord, and had given it a very candid examination ; but had never tully committed himself to it until Brother Miller's lectures in the church of which he had the pastoral charge. He, from that time, became a decided advocate of the doctrine, and has since devoted himself to its advocacy.

In the latter part of November, the writer, in connection with some friends, determined on another attempt to go into the south. We went to Baltimore, Maryland, and finding no place open to receive the message, the lecture-room of the Universalist church was rented for the purpose, and a course of lectures commenced. The attendance was small, and prejudice strong. After a few lectures there, the Odd Fellows' Hall was rented, lectures commenced, an interest excited, which continues to the present time. The effect of the success in Baltimore has been most salutary on the southern states. The prejudice has greatly given way, and an open door into the south now presents itself. The late visits of brethren Chandler and Brewer into Virginia, North and South Carolina, show that there is a hearing ear, and that, if time continues, the field will be one of importance as a scene of successful labor.

The labors and success of Brother J. R. Gates, in western and central Pennsylvania, are well known by the readers of the "Midnight Cry." The Lord eminently owns his labors in that section of the country, in planting the Advent doctrine, and bringing sinners to Christ.



## MR. MILLER'S VISIT TO WASHINGTON.

It had long been in contemplation, by Brother Himes, in company with Brother Miller, to visit Washington City, District of Columbia, and sound the alarm in the Capital of the nation ; but no opportunity presented itself for doing so, until the past winter. Commencing in Boston, they lectured in that city, and from thence came to New York ; delivered a course of lectures to a numerous audience ; from thence visited Philadelphia, spent a week, and gave a course of lectures to an immense concourse of people, with very great effect. From Philadelphia he, in company with the writer, went to Washington and commenced a course of lectures, February 20, 1844. Two weeks were spent in different sections of the city, in presenting the doctrines of Adventism, and the evidences of the speedy coming of the Lord. The attendance was good, and the interest to hear deep. A greater revolution in public sentiment has rarely been witnessed in so short a time, than was brought about in Washington, in reference to the Advent doctrine. It was during the time of these lectures that the fatal accident occurred on board the Princeton, by which so many prominent members of the government were swept away in a moment. The incident, probably, conduced somewhat to the interest which was felt on the subject of the coming of the Lord. But although the interest was great when the meetings closed, yet, there being no one to stay behind and follow up what had been done, the influence soon passed away and was forgotten.

During our stay in Washington, besides the papers and books which were carried on from the north, a paper was commenced there, called the "*Southern Midnight Cry.*" Two numbers were published and circulated in Washington and vicinity, and another in Baltimore, while Brother Miller was giving his course of lectures in that city. Thus ended the winter of 1843—4, and brought us to the point which had so long been before us,—the end of the Jewish year 1843.

## THE TERMINATION OF THE PROPHEPIC TIMES.

As might be expected, as the crisis, the 21st of March, approached, there was a very general expectation of an entire overthrow of the whole system of Adventism. It was supposed

that those who had embraced it, if the appointed time should pass, would yield the whole question. But they had not so learned the Bible. The doctrine does not consist in merely tracing prophetic periods, although that is an important part of the work. But the whole prophetic history of the world is given in the pages of inspiration, is recorded in history, and affords indubitable evidence of the fact, that we have approached a crisis. And no disappointment respecting a definite point of time can move them, or drive them from their position, relative to the speedy coming of the Lord. And it yet remains to be shown that our calculations of time are not correct, and are only in error relative to the event which marked its close. This is the most likely. There are, at present, some who falter, but comparatively few, however, who have given up the cause. Most stand unmoved amidst all the scoffs and jeers of a reviling world.

**FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES \* ON WHICH THE SECOND ADVENT  
CAUSE IS BASED.**

I.—The word of God teaches that this earth is to be regenerated, in the restitution of all things, and restored to its Eden state as it came from the hand of its Maker before the fall, and is to be the eternal abode of the righteous in their resurrection state.

II.—The only millennium found in the word of God, is the 1000 years which are to intervene between the first and second resurrection, as brought to view in the 20th of Revelation. And the various portions of Scripture which are adduced as evidence of such a period in time, are to have their fulfilment only in the New Earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

III.—The only restoration of Israel yet future, is the restoration of the Saints to the New Earth, when the Lord my God shall come, and all his saints with him.

IV.—The signs which were to precede the coming of our Savior, have all been given; and the prophecies have all been fulfilled but those which relate to the coming of Christ, the end of this world, and the restitution of all things.

V.—There are none of the prophetic periods, as we understand them, that extend beyond the [Jewish] year 1843.

¶ The above we shall ever maintain as the immutable truths of the word of God, and therefore, till our Lord come, we shall ever look for his return as the next event in historical prophecy.

---

\* The above was written in the Jewish year 1843, which has now expired. According to the best chronologers, the captivity of Manasseh, the commencement of the seven times, or 2520 years of Levit. 26th, was B. C. 677; also the captivity of Jehoiakim, the commencement of the Great Jubilee, or 2450 years, was B. C. 607; also the decree to rebuild Jerusalem in the seventh of Artaxerxes, the commencement of the 70 weeks and 2300 days, of Dan. 8th and 9th, was given B. C. 457; and

The foregoing principles have constituted the basis of Adventism, and the ground on which the friends of the cause, of all sects and parties, have labored harmoniously together. It has not been our wish in presenting these truths to build up a sect, but to meet as Christians, with all sects, and if God in mercy bless our labors, leave those converted to God to unite and live in peace and love with the church with which they might be connected. But this could not be. Very few churches have been found which were sufficiently alive to God, to be willing to hear of the coming of the Lord. A spirit of opposition to the introduction of the Christian's hope in social meetings, has almost everywhere been exhibited. The doors of churches have been closed against lectures, and every possible means used to prevent the spread of light on the subject. Under these circumstances, those who wished to hear were under the necessity of opening separate meetings for the lectures, or not have them at all. The same has been the fact with respect to social meetings. When forbidden to speak of their hope of seeing the King in his beauty, in the social meetings of the church, those who have been interested in the question, could only go by themselves and enjoy the privilege. The fact has developed a very great and strange dereliction in piety in the various churches. What, profess to be the friends and lovers of Jesus, and yet be offended and disturbed at hearing the glorious tidings, "Behold, he cometh!" O, tell it not in Gath.

"But," it is answered, "we only object to your setting the time." It would do very well to make such a reply, if we did not happen to know that there is the same opposition against the doctrine of Christ's speedy coming, that there is to the time itself. But such is the fact. Where there is a real love for the appearing of the Savior, there is no trouble about the time. Such persons have no objection to learn all that the

---

also the taking away of Paganism in Rome, the commencement of the 1335 days of Dan. 12th, was about A. D. 508. Reckoning from those several dates, the respective periods can extend only to about the Jewish Year 1843. This being ended, our published time is now past; but as we can find no new dates for the events from which we have reckoned those periods, we cannot extend them beyond the time specified, which has been our only time; and yet our faith is as strong as ever, that at the end of those periods the Lord will surely come; while we can only wait for his coming such time as human chronology may have varied from the exact time,—continually looking for, and momentarily expecting his appearing. This we do in accordance with Hab. ii. 3.—"For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end" (of the prophetic periods) "it shall speak and not lie; though it tarry" (beyond their apparent termination) "wait for it; because" (when they are fulfilled) "it will surely come, it will not tarry."

word of God has made known respecting the time of the Bridegroom's coming.

The unwillingness to hear on the subject, has *usually* originated in a want of readiness to meet the Lord *now*. Perhaps not a more sure test can be given of a state of grace, than a real genuine feeling that we should like to see the Lord *now*. Reader, can you say thus in sincerity and truth?

#### MODES OF OPPOSITION.

It has usually been the fact that, as soon as the doctrine of the Lord's speedy coming has been presented in any place, the clergy, in the course of one or two weeks, would begin their attacks from the pulpit. The usual argument has been, 1. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; yet these men profess to know the very time when the Lord is to come. Yes, they profess to know more than the angels, or even the Son of God himself."

2. "The Lord cannot come until after the millennium, during which the whole world is to be righteous, and the lion eat straw like the ox," &c.

3. "The Jews must be brought in, and restored to Palestine, before that day comes."

4. "It is to come as a thief, as a snare, &c., on all them that dwell on the earth. But now there are so many who are looking for it, that it cannot come as a snare."

5. "It cannot come now, because there are so many learned and holy ministers and Christians, that if it should come now, it would take them by surprise. The Lord will not come without their knowing it."

6. "The world is yet in its infancy; the arts and sciences are just beginning to come to maturity, and fit the world to live, and it cannot be that the Lord will come now and destroy it all."

7. "Then, again, there is so much waste land to be occupied in the western country, land which has never yet been cultivated at all, that it is not at all reasonable that the Lord should destroy it all, before it has been improved."

8. But the great argument, the one which has proved the most effectual, has been, that this vision of Daniel viii. has nothing to do with the coming of Christ, or setting up of God's everlasting kingdom. It simply refers to Antiochus Epiphanes, and his persecution of the Jews, and desecration

of the temple, some 160 odd years B. C. Thus we have the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, for which the Savior taught his people to look, about two hundred years before the instruction was given.

To the foregoing might be added a number more of the same class, *professedly* drawn from reason and Scripture, but none of them more formidable than those already recorded. Do you smile, gentle reader, at the idea of calling these, *arguments*? Yet, you may be assured that each of them in turn has been urged by grave men, calling themselves *Doctors of Divinity*.

But the most wonderful and overwhelming of all arguments which have ever been presented against the doctrine, is, "MR. MILLER HAS BUILT SOME STONE WALL ON HIS FARM!!!" But, I forget myself; I said the most wonderful; there is another quite its equal: "MR. MILLER REFUSES TO SELL HIS FARM!!!" *How, O! how CAN Christ come, when Mr. Miller will not sell his farm???*

But, this is not all; for the truth is, "MR. HIMES HAS PUBLISHED AND SCATTERED, (a large part of them gratuitously) MORE THAN FIVE MILLION OF BOOKS AND PAPERS. HE MUST BE ENGAGED IN A SPECULATION; AND HOW CAN THE LORD COME?? O! HOW CAN HE COME???"

But to be serious; a word on this subject is due these men, and the cause whose advocates they have been. For those who have known William Miller, and have known his personal history, it is not needful we should write. But there are those who know him not; on their account it is, that this memento is here inserted.

When Mr. Miller first commenced the advocacy of the Advent doctrine, he was engaged in agricultural pursuits. He had a farm of his own, was surrounded by an interesting family, and possessed all that could make life easy and agreeable. When the Lord called and thrust him out into this work, he was in the decline of life, without the advantages of an academical education, without experience as a public speaker, without ecclesiastical preferments, except as a valued and worthy lay member of the Baptist church; the prejudices of both the church and world were decidedly against all attempts to understand the prophetic scriptures, with many other discouraging circumstances. Yet, in the face of all

discouragements, he went forth taking nothing ; but as freely did he bestow on others the light which God had given, as he had received it.

For a number of years after he began this work, he travelled extensively, lectured frequently, endured privation and scoffing, and paid all the expenses of his journeys from his own funds. At the same time he had a large family dependent on him for their subsistence, besides keeping open doors for all the Lord's servants, who should choose to come under his roof ; where they were always sure to find a hearty welcome.

After pursuing this course for some years, he arranged his domestic affairs, by giving up his farm into the hands of his sons, so as to sustain his family, and have an annuity of one hundred dollars, to clothe himself and meet his other incidental expenses. In this way he continued to travel far and near, wherever Providence opened the way, and for the most part bearing his own expenses. This he did until his journeys became so numerous, long, and expensive, as to exceed his income. Then he permitted the people among whom he labored to pay his travelling expenses. But he has not received enough, since he began his work, to sustain him in it. From the sale of his books he has received no profit. It has been no part of his business to lay up treasures on earth, or accumulate wealth by the gospel of God's grace.

Amidst all the vile and reproachful epithets which have been heaped upon him, all the false and scurrilous reports which have gone the rounds of both pulpit and press, as well as private circles, he has gone on, still pursuing the even tenor of his way, accomplishing the mission on which he set forth.

If his remarks concerning the attacks which have been made upon him, have sometimes seemed severe, it will not be wondered at, when it is recollected that it is nothing else but the severity of truth. We will not pretend to say that he has never erred ; but this we do say, while we confess, that "to err is human," few men have gone through an enterprise like this, with fewer errors or blemishes than William Miller.

So, likewise, in exposing and reproving the growing corruptions of the church and ministry, he has been thought by many too severe. But this, too, has consisted in the severity of truths which few, in an age of degeneracy like this, had

either the independence or courage to speak out. He has spoken aloud what others have thought and repeated only in private. Yet, after all, who that knows the man, but loves him? Take him all in all, where could an instrument be found better qualified for the station he has filled?

A few words respecting that faithful and devoted friend of the cause of Adventism, J. V. Himes, must close this part of the present work.

From the position he has occupied in the front of the battle, the most deadly shafts of the enemy have been aimed at him. The generous spirit of self-sacrifice, with which he came forward and exerted every nerve for the advancement of this great work, excited at once the envy, the wrath, the anger and calumny of the whole host of foes to the doctrine. And no means which could be devised to blast his influence has been wanting from that to the present time. But, through grace, he has thus far triumphed.

From the commencement of his course as an advocate of this cause, the writer has been on terms of intimacy with him, and has known his whole course, and feels it to be a great pleasure to say, that a more noble-hearted, generous, and self-denying man never engaged in any enterprise. That the Advent book establishment has yielded profits which might have enriched him, is true; but that it *has* done this, is utterly false and groundless. The funds which have accrued from the sale of books, have been appropriated to the advancement of the work of God, the spreading of the glad tidings of his kingdom.

The labors and fatigues he has endured in the work which has engrossed his attention, are too well known to require repetition here. No man can be found whose labors have been more abundant and arduous than his.

When this work first began, it was a question of expediency whether the book business should be made public stock, or remain in his hands. Advisers were then few, and the decision was, that it would be best for the cause, produce less difficulty and strife, besides expediting the great object we had in view, to have it in the hands of some individual as his private property, to dispose of the whole as he judged best. With the wisdom of that decision, the writer is more and more satisfied every successive day. That the funds could have been better appropriated, or indeed more satisfactorily, by any association or committee which could have been created, I do not believe.

I believe the Providence of God raised up J. V. Himes as an associate and fellow-helper of Mr. Miller, in the great work of arousing the church and the world to prepare for the coming of the Lord ; and that he has performed the work with fidelity to God and man, and honor to himself.

Those brethren will forgive the liberty I have used, of speaking so freely of their personal character, and course of conduct : it is a strain to which my pen is unused ; and so it should remain, did not the vile and slanderous insinuations which have been made against them, demand it at my hand. An attempt to give a history of the Second Advent cause would not be complete, without such a testimony.

#### THE EFFECT OF THE OPPOSITION

Has invariably advanced the cause it was intended to destroy. Such has been the weakness of the arguments against the doctrine of the Lord's coming, that very many, who were hesitating as to its truth or falsehood, have decided in its favor ; for, said they, if this is the strongest evidence which exists against it, there must be something in it. This has led to examination and conviction. So, also, many who were ignorant of the question in all its bearings, have been notified of the existence of such a doctrine by the pulpit labors of their minister, or an attack through the columns of their newspaper. It has been most emphatically true in this case, that " we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

The same remarks as the above will hold true in respect to the *learned* works of Professors Stuart and Chase, together with the efforts of Folsom, Pond, Weeks, Hinton, Wheedon, Dowling, Colver, and a host of others, who have undertaken to overthrow Adventism. It would be a curiosity for one who is fond of such work, to trace the great variety of conflicting sentiments which have been set forth by these different authors, as antidotes to the doctrine of Christ's speedy coming. Little more need be done to prove Adventism true, and overthrow all that has been written against it, than to collate the works of its various opponents.

#### EXTENT OF THE WORK—GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE INSTRUMENTS BY WHICH IT HAS ADVANCED.

We look upon the proclamation which has been made, as being the cry of the angel who proclaimed, "*the hour of*



*his judgment is come.*" (Revelation xiv. 6, 7.) It is a sound which is to reach all nations ; it is the proclamation of "*the everlasting gospel*," or "*this gospel of the kingdom*." In one shape or other, this cry has gone abroad through the earth wherever human beings are found, and we have had opportunity to hear of the fact.

Within the last six years, publications, treating on the subject, have been sent to nearly every English and American Missionary station on the globe ; to all, at least, to which we have had access.

Then, again, the great religious papers of the country have all aided in this work ; for some of them have published our views, as written by friends, and others have published reviews and overthrows, in which our arguments must be presented, in order to refute them.

By these the truth has been spread into many places where it could not have reached by the ordinary means.

Then, again, the caricatures which have been scattered among the rabble, have carried the great point with them, the coming of the Lord to judgment, and the time of his coming.

The secular press has contributed, in no small degree, to increase and spread an interest on the question. Even the foolish and false statements which have been put forth have, in some instances, only turned out for the advancement of the work of God. The story, for instance, which was started by the "*New York Sun*," that Mr. Miller had fixed on the 23d of April, 1843, as the time for Christ to come, although entirely false and baseless in itself, yet was so widely circulated, that there was scarcely a place known where the report was not heard, and an interest awakened.

#### ADVENT BOOKS.

These have been greatly multiplied within the last four years. As already remarked, the first, and most important work published, was Mr. Miller's Lectures. That volume may be regarded as the seed from which all the rest have germinated.

The works of Miller, Ward, Hale, Bliss, Fitch, Storrs, Brown, Hervey, Cook, Whiting, Starkweather, Hawley, Litch, Fleming, Cox, Sabine, &c., constitute the Second Advent Library, and exhibit the views which have been presented to the public by the lecturers. Other sheets and pamphlets have been published.

Some of the sheets which have been published and circulated have accomplished a vast amount of good. The "*Clue to the Time*," written by Brother L. Hersey, a shoemaker in Boston, and a city watchman, with a diagram, has been the means of great good. Eternity alone will reveal the many precious souls who have been led to look for the Lord's coming, from the reading of one of those sheets.

#### LECTURERS AND WRITERS.

The mass of lecturers who have been raised up and thrust forth into this work, have been men of sound minds, warm hearts, full of zeal for God and the salvation of men. They have made no great pretensions to learning, in its common acceptance; but yet, as a general thing, they have been close students of the Bible, making it a self-interpreting book. Nor have they been altogether inattentive to history as their time and means have allowed. It is true that, so far as they have been successful in their work, the excellency of the power has been of God.

But there have been some raised up among us, of commanding talents and acquirements; men, who need not blush to stand by the side of the wise and learned of the earth. These were raised up at a time when such assistance was needed, and God has accomplished his work by them.

The Advent writings exhibit minds accustomed to think and reason, as well as read. Although the mass of the books lay no claim to literary merit, yet they have done more to promote a sound, healthy, moral literature, than any other books of the age. They have so selected and arranged historical incidents in connection with the prophetic Scriptures, which embrace the history of the world, as to invest that history with an interest which the mass of readers never before saw or felt. If they have promoted the study of history, much more have they induced a careful study of the Scriptures.

It is a lamentable fact, that although this is an age of Bibles, yet the great body of professing Christians know but little what that Bible contains. But wherever Advent books have been circulated, instead of superseding the use of the Bible, as most books do, they have almost invariably sent the reader to the sacred store-house. Nothing ever given to the public has excited so much interest in the study of the Bible

as the proclamation of "*the hour of his judgment*." A course of lectures in a village, would open a door for the sale of more Bibles in a week than would have been sold before for years. Whatever may be the final issue of this question, so far its fruits have been of the best character.

#### WHAT ADVENTISM HAS ACCOMPLISHED.

1. When this cry first commenced, the prophecies were generally looked upon as a book of mysteries, which it was presumption, if not sacrilege, to attempt to understand or explain. That spell has been broken, and the Christian public understand that those deeply interesting portions of the word of God are also a part of his revelation to man. And even the clergy, of all orders, have been constrained to speak out and give some explanation of the prophecies, however crude it might be.

2. The fable of the world's conversion, and the universal triumph of Christianity, which almost universally prevailed — ten years ago, has been exploded, and the church now understands that the Man of sin is to remain in the world until the Lord comes and destroys him by the brightness of his coming. That there is to be no millennium until "*the first resurrection*," at the coming of the Lord. That idea cannot be made to grow again as it has done..

3. That kindred doctrine, the return of the Jews to Palestine, where they are again to be exalted to peculiar privileges, is exposed, and the old apostolic doctrine, that there is no respect of persons with God, is made to stand out in bold relief, so that the church must see and acknowledge it to be the truth of God.

4. It has produced a very general conviction on the public mind, that we are near the end of time, and just ready to appear before the bar of God. The general outlines of prophecy, as exhibited in the four great kingdoms, is seen and acknowledged by very many to be nearly accomplished. And hence the conviction fastens on the mind, that the end of all things is at hand.

5. It has developed a vast amount of German rationalism, neology and infidelity in the church, and has demonstrated the fact, that nearly, or quite all our theological schools are under its influence. And it has proved, that if the Lord

does not come speedily and end the strife, that the country must soon be flooded with this system of neology.

6. Wherever it has gone, the Advent doctrine has awakened sinners, reclaimed backsliders, quickened believers, and promoted the cause of God generally. Thousands on thousands can witness the truth of this remark in their own experience; and will have cause to bless God eternally for the Advent doctrine and Advent preaching.

7. It has shown professedly orthodox ministers to be so degenerate in their sentiments, as to make common cause with infidels and Universalists against the coming of the Lord. And has also shown the church to be so degenerate as to cast out her children for looking for, and speaking of the return of her Lord.

8. It has given to the church and world a simple, plain, common-sense system of interpretation of the sacred canon, so that every man, who will take the trouble of reading the Bible, and collating the different portions of it, may understand the word of God without the aid of learned commentaries.

#### PERMANENCY OF THE WORK.

No provision has been made for the establishment of permanent institutions, among Adventists. Indeed, we have no means of ascertaining the number of ministers, and others, who have embraced the Advent faith. We only know that there are several hundred congregations, and a still larger number of ministers, who have publicly professed the faith, besides many who still remain in the churches of the land. Those who have espoused this cause have honestly believed in the coming of the Lord "about A. D. 1843." And, as honest men, they have kept to their work of sounding the alarm. All peculiarities of creed or policy have been lost sight of, in the absorbing inquiry concerning the coming of the heavenly Bridegroom. Those who have engaged in this enterprise are from all the various sects in the land. Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Primitive Methodist, Wesleyan Methodist, Close Communion Baptist, and Open Communion Baptist, Calvinistic and Arminian Baptists, Presbyterians, Old and New School Congregationalists, Old and New School Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, &c., &c. All these have agreed to work together for the accomplish-

ment of a certain object ; and the organization to which this has given rise, so far as there is anything which may be called an organization, is of the most simple, voluntary and primitive form. While the engrossing and scriptural character of the grand object has kept those who have been brought under its influence above the considerations which so generally divide the household of faith, it has also made them frank and kind in expressing their minor differences, and forbearing towards each other on subordinate questions upon which they may not see alike. And in this is their strength. We neither expect nor desire any other organization, until we reach the New Jerusalem, and organize under the King of kings. Here, we are pilgrims and strangers, with no abiding place. There, we shall have a permanent rest, and dwell forever under his protection.

When the Lord brings again the captivity of Zion, not before, he will turn to the people a pure language.

Until that time comes the work of Adventists is a plain one, to go through the land and sound the alarm in the ears of all men, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him."

#### CHRISTIAN ORDINANCES.

These have been regularly administered among Adventists, by the ordained ministers from all the various denominations composing the Advent ranks. In administering the Lord's supper, no test has been required ; but each one who comes to the table does it on his own responsibility, being accountable to God and his own conscience, whether he eat or drink worthily or unworthily. And on this principle there is an agreement, with few exceptions, to continue to remember, and show forth the Lord's death until he come.

#### THE CAUSE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

For the last fifty years, the doctrine of the pre-millennial Advent has been ably advocated in England. The doctrines of the early Christian fathers were brought forward and vindicated in a manner and with a power honorable both to the heads and hearts of their advocates. But in the connection with the true scriptural and plain doctrine of the Bible, they mixed with it the crude notions of a mixed state, of probation

and mortality with glorification and immortality, during the thousand years ; and also held to the return of the Jewish nation, both to Christ and Palestine, in the millennium.

- The Millennarians, holding these views, and looking for the speedy coming of Christ, have become very numerous in England, Ireland and Scotland. Indeed, some of the brightest lights of those countries are of that school.

In 1840, an attempt was made to open an interchange between the Literalists of England and the Adventists in the United States. But it was soon discovered that they had as little fellowship for our Anti-Judaizing notions, as we had for their Judaism ; and the interchange was broken off.

- In 1842, Robert Winter, an Englishman by birth, and a Primitive Methodist by profession, fell in with the Adventists in this country, and embraced the doctrine. In the fall of the year he resolved to return to England and proclaim the coming of the Lord. He did return, and commenced the work. God owned his truth, it took effect, and many have been raised up to join with him in spreading the light through these Islands of the sea. Last summer, camp or field meetings were held in different parts of England with great success.

Books and papers to a large amount have been sent to England, and scattered abroad through the country ; and several books and papers have been re-published in that country with great effect.

- The British provinces, adjoining the United States, have been visited and furnished with the light. Our beloved brother Hutchinson, in Montreal, has published a large amount of matter in his paper, "*The Voice of Elijah*," and sent it over the United Kingdoms.

But I must close this brief sketch of the rise and progress of Adventism, or my space will be more than full. But a few, only, out of the multitude of incidents which should enter into a work of this kind, have been noticed. But this is all we have room to give in the present sketch. The Judge is at the door, and will make a more full and accurate development of this great work, than human heart can indite or hand record. Concerning Adventism, it may be truly said, "What hath God wrought ?"

No cause of a moral or religious character, probably, ever made so rapid advances, as the cause of Adventism. Its votaries have usually been the most humble, pious, devoted

members of the different churches ; men and women, who love their Lord, and to whom the thought of his glorious Advent has been a source of sweetest pleasure. The hand of Providence has every where opened the way, and provided the means for doing all that human means could do. None of the lecturers have made themselves rich, or even held what little they had when they embarked in the enterprise. Every thing has been freely sacrificed when the cause demanded it. Never have a set of men labored more faithfully and zealously in the cause of God, or with purer motives. But their work is with the Lord, and their record on high.

It is asked what we intend to do, now the time is expired ? Our answer is—we intend, by the Lord's help, to spread the glad tidings of the kingdom of God until it appears. The arguments which have been presented on the prophetic history and periods, together with the signs of the times, have lost none of their strength ; and we purpose to continue presenting them, until the Master comes, that we may be found giving his "household meat in due season."

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### *Prophetic Chronology.*

THE prophecies form an important portion of the word of God. Their fulfilment, as the events which they announce become historical facts, has long been deemed a standing and accumulating proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures. But it is evident that other important objects were designed to be effected by communicating the Holy Spirit to the ancient seers. Future events were made known, that the attention of man might be awakened to those events ; that sinners might be warned of approaching results, and by repentance escape the judgment of God ; and that the saints might have a constant sense of the great fact, that Jehovah is the moral governor of the world ; that in times of darkness, when clouds rested on the interests of Zion, they might look forward to brighter and better days. The dogma, that prophe-

cy is unintelligible until it receives a fulfilment, does not seem to have existed in ages when prophets uttered the living oracles of truth. Recently we have heard that dogma maintained with a confidence which seems to challenge refutation.—Among the latest counsels of an apostle, who had been with Christ in the holy mount, we find the following words, 2 Peter, i. 19, 20—“We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation: for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” We find a declaration, in the prophetic portion of the Scriptures, which deserves the serious consideration of all reflecting minds, more especially as that very portion has been by many deemed unintelligible on account of its intrinsic obscurity. Rev. i. 1—3—“The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw.—Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand.” Now it is quite plain that the reading or hearing of an unintelligible document could be attended with neither a blessing nor an advantage to any man, nor could the ideas contained in such a document be kept or obeyed by any one, who could not understand what those ideas were. As the direction and the promise which has been quoted extends to the entire book, it will of course comprehend the language, which mentions certain periods of time, such as “five months,” Rev. ix. 5; “an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year,” Rev. ix. 15; “a thousand two hundred and three score days,” Rev. xi. 3; and xii. 6; “three days and a half,” verse 9; “a time, and times, and half a time,” Rev. xii. 14.

It is worthy of notice that in the numerous directions which call our attention to the word of God, we find no distinction made which would enable us to classify them as *intelligible* and *unintelligible*, *important* and *useless*; on the contrary, when Christ said to the unbelieving Jews, John v.



39, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me," it is an obvious fact that the prophetic portion of the Old Testament must have been more especially in his view, and the command to "search," implies that an investigation would not be in vain.

The unsoundness of the principle that prophecy cannot be understood before its fulfilment, stands contradicted by the Scriptures. Did not "Noah, being warned of God, of things *not seen as yet*, moved with fear, prepare an ark to the saving of his house?" Was it not by understanding and believing *an unfulfilled prediction*, that he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith? So the approach of the famine, which was announced by the dreams of Pharaoh and their interpretation by Joseph, would appear to have been predicted so clearly, that long before the event transpired, arrangements were made to meet the dearth: nor does the chronological notice of the point of fulfilment seem to have thrown any obscurity over the prediction. Similar instances, recorded in the Scriptural history, will readily occur to the reader's mind. It seems to have been a fact, that, as to the more important events in the history of our race, which have been the subjects of prophecy, periods of time for their fulfilment were announced. Such, at all events, was the case in reference to the flood—the famine to which we have alluded—the sojourning of Israel in Egypt—the wandering of the tribes in the wilderness—the Babylonian captivity—the first Advent of the Savior,—and, as some believe, in reference to that period, when He shall come the *second time* without sin unto salvation.

Now, in view of such facts, it may not be so irrational as some would make us believe, if we should endeavor to search the prophetic Scriptures, or compare events with inspired predictions; nor is it perhaps either an evidence of fanaticism or folly, if we conclude that attention to *the chronology of prophecy* deserves our regard, or if we should arrive at the result, that revelation, on all points, was made for the benefit of all, who do not prefer darkness to light.

There is an important rule of interpretation applicable to all portions of Holy Writ, which demands attention from those who wish to learn the mind of the Spirit. It is this, that as God, in his communications to man, employs human language as a medium for those communications, he uses it

in precisely the same manner as man would do. The circumstances of those whom he addresses are kept in view, such as their standard of scientific knowledge, their customs and habits of thinking. In short, Jehovah takes his stand as a man when he speaks to man, at least, *so far as language* is employed. It is well known that the sciences, which have been so much cultivated in later ages, were in a state of infancy, especially among the Hebrews, at the time when holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Hence, as the Jews supposed that the earth was a plane with four corners, the Lord speaks in conformity with their views when he mentions "the four corners of the earth." Material objects on earth and in the sky are described as they appeared to the eyes of the men whom he addressed. Hence, the sun and moon are mentioned as the two great lights of heaven, although modern astronomy has demonstrated the fact, that many stars are of greater magnitude than the moon. Thus, as the Hebrews deemed the heart the seat of thought, no attempt is made to teach them physical or metaphysical science. God speaks of a wise and understanding *heart*. The only exception to this last case will be found in the book of Daniel, which was written in Chaldea, where science was much farther advanced than in Palestine. Hence, in this book, we find such expressions as "the visions of thy *head* upon thy bed." Dan. ii. 28.

The principle which has just been noticed is applicable to the modes of computing time, which were used by the Hebrews. From some examples that will soon be adduced, it will be seen that there is a latitude often employed in estimating days and years, which varies very considerably from the mathematical accuracy common in later times, especially among the nations of the west. Now, in attempting to interpret the Scriptures, in cases where there is reference to periods of time, it is obvious that we must adopt that mode of estimation which was common among the Jews, because the communication from God having been made to *them*, *their usage was the standard*. By looking at the Scriptures, we can ascertain what that usage was, and avoid any danger of mistake—but, on the other hand, had the Lord, in speaking to them, adopted a usage which was to prevail in a later age, the communication would not have been adapted to their use, unless he had enlarged the range of revelation by teaching *natural* as well as *moral* science.

An examination of various passages where estimates of time are given in the Scriptures, will convince the reader of the following facts, viz: 1. In a period of years, the *first* and *last* terms of the series are often reckoned inclusive, although our usage would lead us to omit the *first* term. 2. There are cases where the Hebrews estimate years as we do, omitting the first term of the series. 3. There are also cases where both the *first* and *last terms* of the series are omitted, when, of course, they would make the series exceed our estimate by nearly a year.

Illustrations of the first mode. 1 Kings, xv. 1, 2, "Now in the eighteenth year of king Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, reigned Abijam over Judah. Three years reigned he in Jerusalem." Verse 8, 9, "And Abijam slept with his fathers; and they buried him in the city of David: and Asa his son reigned in his stead. And in the twentieth year of Jeroboam king of Israel reigned Asa over Judah."

It will at once be seen, that we should estimate his reign at *two years*. Yet the Biblical computation makes the period *three*, by counting the eighteenth year, the first term of the series, as a *whole* year, and the twentieth, the last term, also, as a *whole* year.. In this case, therefore, a portion of a year is regarded as an entire year.

1 Kings xv. 25, 28, "And Nadab the son of Jeroboam began to reign over Israel in the second year of Asa king of Judah, and reigned over Israel two years. Even in the third year of Asa, king of Judah, did Baasha slay him, and reigned in his stead." Here the *second* year of Asa and his *third* year are each estimated as full years—although we should say from the *second* to the *third* year there could have been but *one* year.

1 Kings xvi. 8, 10.—"In the twentieth and sixth year of Asa king of Judah began Elah the son of Baasha to reign over Israel two years. And Zimri went in and smote him, and killed him, in the twenty-and-seventh year of Asa king of Judah, and reigned in his stead." This case is precisely like the last.

See also the notice of the time of Baasha's reign, in 1 Kings, xv. 33; and xvi. 6—8; the reign of Jotham, 2 Kings, xv. 32; and xvi. 1.

In 2 Kings xvii. 1, we are told that "in the twelfth year of Ahaz king of Judah began Hoshea the son of Elah to reign in Samaria over Israel nine years." Yet in verse 6 we read,

"In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria," &c. Here the *current* year, the *ninth*, is reckoned as a *full* year.

1 Kings, xxii. 1, 2, "And they continued three years without war between Syria and Israel. And it came to pass *in* the *third* year, that Jehoshaphat the king of Judah came down to the king of Israel," &c. to the end of the chapter.

Illustration of the second mode of computation. 2 Kings, xv. 23, 27, "In the fiftieth year of Azariah (called also Uzziah) king of Judah, Pekahiah the son of Menahem began to reign over Israel in Samaria, and reigned two years." "In the two-and-fiftieth year of Azariah king of Judah, Pekah the son of Remaliah began to reign over Israel in Samaria," &c. In this instance, the two years of Pekah's reign are computed by omitting the first term, (namely, the fiftieth year of Azariah, and counting the last term, namely, the fifty-second,) precisely as they would be reckoned according to *our* practice.

Illustration of the third mode of computation. 2 Kings, xv. 17, 22, 23, "In the nine-and-thirtieth year of Azariah king of Judah began Menahem the son of Gadi to reign over Israel, and reigned ten years in Samaria." "And Menahem slept with his fathers; and Pekahiah his son reigned in his stead." "In the fiftieth year of Azariah king of Judah, Pekahiah the son of Menahem began to reign over Israel in Samaria," &c. Now the modern estimate of Menahem's reign would be made thus:—

|      |                       |
|------|-----------------------|
|      | 50th year of Azariah, |
| 39th | do. do.,              |

---

11 years.

Hence the inspired writer has omitted both the first and the last terms of the series, namely, the 39th and 50th years, and hence he fixes the reign at *ten* years. So in 1 Kings, xvii. 1; and xviii. 1, "And Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the inhabitants of Gilead, said unto Ahab, as the Lord God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years, but according to my word. And it came to pass after many days that the word of the Lord came to Elijah *in the third* year, saying, go, show thyself unto Ahab; and I will send rain upon the earth."

From these two passages we should, perhaps, conclude that the famine continued two years and part of another, yet from

Luke iv. 25, and James v. 17, we learn that this was not the period. "But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heavens was shut up *three years and six months*, when great famine was throughout all the land." "Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth for the space of three years and six months." The result of these examples is, that when the Hebrews computed a period of years as seven, twenty, &c., there was a limited *range* of time within which they would regard the period as accomplished. To illustrate this, let it be supposed that, according to modern rules of computation, seven complete years would terminate on the thirty-first day of December. They would have reckoned any portion of the *current* year from January first, down to, or including that day of December as the last of the seven years, or they would have used the same phrase, "seven years," during any part of the year *which followed* the 31st day. The range of time, then, for the end of the "seven years," would have embraced a space of about one year before and one year after the *exact point*, at which we should say, "the time is fulfilled."

Attempts to fix precise days, or even months, for the accomplishment of prophetic periods of years, must, in view of this principle, be altogether conjectural. The uncertainty, which must result from these attempts, will be seen at once, if we recollect that the Jewish calendar having reference to the changes of the moon, and their year being of course about eleven days short of the solar year—an addition of a whole month is requisite, at least once in three years, to bring the lunar and solar time to a coincidence. It is singular that some learned men, overlooking this obvious difficulty, have told us that the death of the Savior occurred four hundred and ninety years, to a *day*, from the date in which the command went forth to restore and rebuild Jerusalem. They seem to have forgotten, that the nearest approach which can be made on *sure* ground to the period of issuing that command, is furnished in the Scriptural history, Ezra vii. 9, "For upon the first day of the first month (Nisan or Abib) began he (Ezra) to go up from Babylon, and on the first day of the fifth month (Ab) came he to Jerusalem, according to the good hand of his God upon him."

## THE "TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED DAYS."

The principles which have been noticed, may aid in the investigation of the prophetic period, which is presented in Daniel viii. 13, 14. "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain *saint* which spake, How long *shall be* the vision *concerning* the daily *sacrifice*, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The following translation is more literal:—"And I heard one holy being talking, and another holy being said to that certain one who was talking, Unto when, the vision, the continual, and the desolating transgression, to give the sanctuary and the host *to be* a treading down? And he said to me, unto evening morning, two thousand three hundred, then (or *and*) the sanctuary shall be cleansed," (or vindicated.)

In reference to the period of time indicated by this phraseology, three theories have been advocated. 1. It signifies two thousand three hundred literal days. 2. As the terms "morning, evening" are used; these terms refer to a morning and evening sacrifice, and hence the whole period, two thousand three hundred being divided by two, the time is 1150 literal days. In other words, according to the first theory, the period is about six years and four months—according to the second, about three years and two months.

That both these theories are erroneous, is plain from the fact, that as the first symbol in the vision is the ram with two horns, (verse 3,) and this symbol is explained, in verse 20, to be the kings, or kingdoms, of Media and Persia, or the two dominions in their united state; and the next symbol, "the rough goat," is also made the representation of the king (or kingdom) of Grecia, and the four horns of the goat are also explained to signify four kingdoms, (verse 22,)—the events symbolized must extend through a space of time much longer than six years and four months. Greece and Macedonia (both being the Biblical Grecia) were subject to Alexander B. C. 335. He commenced the invasion of Persia by crossing the Hellespont in the spring of 334 B. C., and winning the battle of Granicus. The decisive battle of Arbela was gained B. C. 331, which put an end to the reign of Darius Codomanus, the

last Persian king. Alexander entered Babylon in the same year. After conquering the East as far as the Indus, he returned to Babylon, where he died in the summer of the year B. C. 323. His kingdom was divided between his four generals, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander, and Lysimachus, B. C. 300. Hence, if we confine our attention *merely* to the events in the history of Grecia, which are represented in the vision by one symbol, (the goat,) the absurdity of either of the theories of interpretation, which have been noticed, is obvious at a glance.

According to the third theory, a day is often used by the prophets as the symbol of a year. Until recently, this symbolic use of the word "day" was not questioned among Protestants, if we except neological writers of the German school. In reference to this point, we are furnished with a decisive proof in Daniel ix. 25: "Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, (Hebrew, *Shábúim shibáh*, "*weeks seven*,"") and three score and two weeks, (Hebrew, *Shábúim shishshim úshenayim*, "*weeks sixty and two*."") No proof can be adduced that the word *Shábúim* signifies *seven*, notwithstanding the assertion has been made lately with great apparent confidence. Both the ancient and modern translations, the Septuagint, Vulgate, &c., render this word *weeks*. Now, then, we are driven to the result, that each day of these weeks is the symbol of a year; otherwise, we make the prophet declare that four hundred and eighty-three literal days would extend from the going forth of the commandment to "the Messiah the Prince," and the prediction would stand contradicted by stubborn facts.

Regarding, therefore, the phrase "two thousand three hundred days" as designed to teach us that the events symbolized in the vision are spread along a duration of 2300 years, an attentive examination of the chapter will convince the inquirer, that while all the symbols exhibited to the eye of the prophet are explained, he is not furnished with the means of ascertaining, with any *definiteness*, the point at which these years were to commence. He could make no nearer approach to this, than by observing that the commencement of the time must be within the period covered by the Medo-Persian dominion. Hence, he says, verse 27, "And I, Daniel, fainted, and was sick certain days; and afterward I rose

up and did the king's business ; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it," or, more literally, "and no one was explaining." The language of Gabriel, who appears for the first time to the prophet, and was directed to make him understand the vision, refers only to the *visible* symbols ; he says nothing respecting the mysterious period of time, but, on the contrary, remarks, in the 26th verse,—“Shut thou up the vision ; for it shall be for many days.” This evidently implies, that beyond the explanation, which had been given, Daniel would not at present be able to comprehend some parts of the divine communication. It was not until “the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans,” (chapter ix. 1, &c.) that the prophet obtained any farther information respecting the vision. It had remained “shut up” until he—having “understood by books the number of the years whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem,”—“set his face unto the LORD God to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth and ashes.” The prophet then narrates the second visit of Gabriel, verse 21,—“Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me.” “Informed me,” Hebrew, *way-yâbin*—literally, “And he explained.” Now, in the last verse of the eighth chapter, the prophet has told us, “no one was explaining.”—Hebrew, “*weén mébin*,”—the connection of these passages will not fail to strike the reader, when he reflects that, in one case, the verb, and in the other, its participle, are used to convey the idea of “explaining.”

Verse 23. “At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee, for thou art greatly beloved : therefore, understand (Hebrew, *ûbin*—the verb, which has already been noticed,) the matter, and consider (Hebrew, *wehâbén*, same verb,) the vision.

If we suppose this language has reference to the vision of the eighth chapter, as seems plain from the terms, and from the fact that full information had not been given on *all* points, in that vision—then we are naturally led to expect that it will no longer be “shut up,” and that the explanation given by the angel will bear directly on the point where the



obscurity rested, that is, that the prophet, or those of later times at least, to whom he "ministered these things," would be enabled to ascertain the commencement of the period of the 2300 days.

Verses 24, 25. "Seventy weeks are determined (Hebrew, *nechtak*, cut off) upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times." Here, then, we are taught that seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years of the time, (2300 years,) which was mentioned in the last chapter, are marked by events having especial reference to "thy people," or the Hebrews. The 490 years are therefore a part of the 2300. The next sentence fixes the point of commencement, *that point* which was left unnoticed "in the vision at the beginning." From "the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince," a period of seven weeks, (equal to forty-nine prophetic days or years,) and also of sixty and two weeks (equal to 434 prophetic days or years, in the whole, 483 years,) were to elapse. The result is, that the commencement of the 2300 years must synchronize with "the going forth of the commandment."

The period of 483 years stands marked by two *monuments*. The going forth of the commandment at the *commencement*, and the manifestation of Jesus as the Anointed One, the Prince, at the *termination*. An especial prominence is given to these two monuments in the prophecy. Hence, neither the period of the *birth* of Christ, nor that of his *crucifixion* are necessary in the adjustment of the chronology of this prophecy, at least, so far as we investigate the commencement of the 2300 years.

#### WHEN DID THE COMMANDMENT GO FORTH?

Not in the first year of Cyrus. His decree, which is recorded in Ezra i. 1—4, merely allows the Jews to return and build the Temple; it also exhorts others to help those, who

would return, "with silver and gold and beasts, beside the free-will offering for the cause of God." Nothing is said in this decree respecting the restoring or building of the city, or regulating the general polity of the Jews. It is true their enemies, in the days of Artaxerxes (the Smerdis of the Greek historians) informed him that the Jews were building "the rebellious and the bad city, and had set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations." This accusation was evidently false, because we are told that when Artaxerxes gave commandment that the city should not be builded, then their adversaries "went up in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power. Then ceased the work of THE HOUSE OF GOD, which is at Jerusalem." See Ezra iv. 8—24.

Again, Cyrus began his reign B. C. 536, and his decree was issued in that year. Now, if we deduct 483 years (the period which was to elapse after the going forth of the commandment to Messiah the Prince,) from 653, we have a remainder of 63 years, and do not reach the *common era* of the birth of Christ by that number of years.

The next decree is that of Darius. Ezra v. 1—17 and Ezra vi. 1—12. This decree is a mere confirmation of that of Cyrus, the substance of which it recites, and in the explanation which it gives points expressly to the building of the Temple, and the expenses necessary to carry on that work, the sacrifices, &c. Darius (Hystaspes) ascended the throne of Persia B. C. 521. Hence a chronological difficulty, similar to that in the case of Cyrus, forbids us to assume his decree as the one intended by the language of the prophecy: thus, 521—483=38. In other words, we do not reach the Christian era by a period of thirty-eight years.

We have then but two other decrees or commands, one issued in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, (Longimanus,) Ezra vii., and the other in the twentieth year of that monarch, Nehemiah ii.

It is well known that very distinguished writers, especially those of England, have maintained that the commission given to Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, was the commandment intended by the prophecy; while, on the other hand, some of equal fame, more particularly on the Continent, have argued that we must look at the twentieth year, when Nehemiah was authorized to leave the Persian court and visit

Jerusalem. Among these last, one of the ablest is Hengstenberg, who, in his "Christology," has examined this question with great ingenuity. As there is a period of thirteen years between the seventh and the twentieth of Artaxerxes, the reader will see that the two classes of writers must have adopted different systems of chronology. Thus, if, according to the canon of the Egyptian geographer and astronomer, Claudius Ptolemy, the reign of Artaxerxes commenced B. C. 464, his seventh year would coincide with B. C. 457, and his twentieth with the year B. C. 444. Now if this date be deducted from the prophetic period of 483 years, we have a remainder of 39 years after the common era, as the *point* when Jesus was manifested as the Messiah. By the admission of all, this is too late. Hence, the advocates of the twentieth year must assail the canon of Ptolemy as incorrect, although it is based on astronomical observations. This has been done by Hengstenberg, the ablest defender of this side of the question, and the only one who has made out a case that has even the appearance of plausibility. Still his result fixes the point for the going forth of the command in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, in the year B. C. 455 ; thus, differing by only two years from those who, according to the canon, regard the seventh year, B. C. 457, as the true date. In favor of the position that the time in question is to be reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes, the following considerations are offered :

First. We are informed, in Ezra vii. 11, "Now this is the copy of the letter that the king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest, the scribe, even a scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord, and of his statutes to Israel." The letter then follows, written not in Hebrew but in Chaldaic (or the Eastern Aramic) the language then used at Babylon. At the 27th verse, the narrative proceeds in Hebrew. We are thus furnished with the *original* document, by virtue of which Ezra was authorized to "restore and build Jerusalem ;" or, in other words, by which he was clothed with power, not merely to erect walls or houses, but regulate the affairs of his countrymen in general, to "set magistrates and judges which may judge all the people beyond the river." He was commissioned to enforce the observance of the laws of his God, and to punish those who transgressed, with death, banishment, confiscation or imprisonment. See vers. 23—27.

No grant of powers thus ample, can be found in the case of Nehemiah, or in any other instance after the captivity. That the commission given to Ezra authorized him to proceed in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, is evident from the fact that in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, who was then in the Persian court, received information that "the remnant who were left of the captivity, then in the province, were in great affliction and reproach; the wall of Jerusalem was broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire." See Nehemiah i. 1—3. The fact is, that Ezra and his associates met with continued opposition from the Samaritans, so that during the whole of the seven weeks, or forty-nine years from the time that Ezra went up, to the last act of Nehemiah in obliging the Jews to put away their strange wives, the prediction of the prophet was verified—"the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times." After Nehemiah reached Jerusalem, he examined the city by night. The result of his examination is thus stated, Nehemiah ii. 13, "And I went out by night, by the gate of the valley, even before the dragon-well, and to the dung-port, and viewed the walls of Jerusalem, which were broken down, and the gates thereof were consumed with fire." It is evident that "the walls and gates" which had been destroyed, were the works of Ezra. The impropriety of referring the language of Nehemiah to the destruction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar will be seen at once, if we recollect that he reduced it to ruins on the capture of Zedekiah, B. C. 588, one hundred and forty-four years previous to the time when Nehemiah went up to Jerusalem.

Secondly. There is a definiteness as to time, when we look at Ezra vii., which is found in no other case. Although the time when his "letter" was written is not given, still his first act in virtue of that letter is noted as having occurred on "the first day of the first month." Verse 9th, "For upon the first day of the first month began he to go up from Babylon," &c. Now, though we are informed (Nehemiah ii. 1, &c.) that Nehemiah made his application to Artaxerxes in the month Nisan, (the first month) in the twentieth year of that king, still we are not made acquainted with the time when his letter to "the governors beyond the river, and to Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest," were written, nor with the time when he commenced or ended his journey.

Reason dictates, that, other circumstances being equal, we should assume the point which is most *definitely* marked for the commencement of the 483 and the 2300 years.

WHAT MONTHS OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR FALL WITHIN THE SEVENTH (OR ANY OTHER YEAR) OF ARTAXERXES?

By comparing the chronological notices furnished by Ezra and Nehemiah, respecting the seventh-and-twentieth years of this king, we can answer this question, if not with entire accuracy, still with an approximation to that point sufficient for all practical purposes.

Ezra vii. 8, 9.—“And he (Ezra) came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king. For upon the first day of the first month began he to go up from Babylon, and on the first day of the fifth month came he to Jerusalem, according to the good hand of his God upon him.” Assuming, for the present, the correctness of the Rabbinical Calendar, we remark that we have the following months, which fall within any year of Artaxerxes’ reign :—

|            |                |             |                    |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1st month— | Abib or Nisan— | 1st day—    | New moon of March. |
| 2d month—  | Ziv or Iyar—   | New moon of | April.             |
| 3d do      | Sivan          | do          | May.               |
| 4th do     | Tammuz         | do          | June.              |
| 5th do     | Ab—            | 1st day do  | July.              |

In other words, *four months*, commencing with the new moon of March, and ending with that of July.

In Nehemiah i. 1, the writer says—“And it came to pass in the month Chisleu, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, as I was in Shushan the palace,” &c.

In pursuing his narrative, he says, again, ii. 1—“And it came to pass in the month Nisan; in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king,” &c. Chisleu is the ninth month, commencing with the new moon of November. The order of the narration shows that it was *that* Chisleu which preceded Nisan in the twentieth year.

If we combine the information given by these two writers, we arrive at the following result :—

|            |          |           |           |                 |
|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| 9th month— | Chisleu— | November— | New moon. | } Eight months. |
| 10th do.   | Tebeth—  | December, | do.       |                 |
| 11th do.   | Shebat—  | January,  | do        |                 |
| 12th do.   | Adar—    | February, | do        |                 |
| 1st do.    | Nisan—   | March,    | do        |                 |
| 2d do.     | Ziv—     | April,    | do        |                 |
| 3d do.     | Sivan—   | May,      | do        |                 |
| 4th do.    | Tammuz—  | June,     | do        |                 |
| 5th do.    | Ab—      | 1st day—  | July,     | do              |

Thus, any year of Artaxerxes would embrace these eight months. Hence his reign must have commenced somewhere between the new moon of July, and that of November, because this is the only space not comprised in the above table.

According to the *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*, there was an "Eclipse of the sun, April 30th, B. C. 464, which was followed by the assassination of Xerxes by Artabanus." Artaxerxes succeeded Xerxes. Hence we may fix his accession to the throne between the months which have been named, in the year B. C. 464. His first year, therefore, would embrace part of 464 and part of 463 B. C. Nisan (the first month) in his first year consequently falls in B. C. 463. His seventh year would commence in B. C. 458, (not earlier than Ab, the fifth month) and end B. C. 457. And, therefore, the first day of the first month, (Nisan) when Ezra left Babylon, was in the same year, B. C. 457.

The commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes can be ascertained by another process.

The battle of Arbela put an end to the Persian monarchy. This battle was preceded by an eclipse of the moon, which occurred September 20th, B. C. 331, eleven days previous to the battle. See *Arrian's Life of Alexander*, B. III, chap. 7; *Quintus Curtius*, B. IV, chap. 39; *Plutarch's Life of Alexander*, and *Ferguson's Table of Eclipses*, in his *astronomy*. The *Canon of Ptolemy* furnishes a history of the kings of Persia, with the period of each reign. He omits those, who did not hold the throne a full year, by reckoning the months of their reign partly to the preceding and partly to the succeeding monarch. Thus Xerxes II. and Sogdianus began to reign B. C. 224. The first reigned two months, and the last seven. Neither are named by Ptolemy; still these nine months being applied to the reigns of Artaxerxes Longimanus and Darius Nothus, no time is actually lost by his computa-

tion. Availing ourselves of the date of the battle of Arbela, which has been noticed, we can employ the Canon, and ascertain the era when Artaxerxes took the crown, by reckoning *backward*.

Darius Codomannus reign'd 4 years to B. C. 331.

Arses, do 2 do

Darius Ochus do 21 do

Artaxerxes Mnemon do 46 do

Darius Nothus do 19 do

Sogdianus do 00 7 months.

Xerxes II. do 00 2 do

Artaxerxes Longimanus 40 3 do

---

133 00 years from B. C. 331

to the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes. If we add 133 to the year B. C. 331, we learn the result 464 B. C.

The *second monument*, marking the manifestation of Jesus as "Messiah the Prince," is exhibited by the evangelist Luke, with a distinctness which indicates the importance of that event as a chronological fact. Luke iii. 1—2.—"Now in the fifteenth year of the reign (Greek *tēs hēgemonías*, 'of the administration,') of Tiberius Cesar, Pontius Pilate being governor (Greek *hēgemoneuontos*, 'administering the government,') of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip, tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias, the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins."—Verses 21, 22. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." By this descent of the Spirit, Jesus became the Messiah, or *Anointed*, the Prince. Thus, Peter says, Acts x. 37,—"That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how GOD ANOINTED JESUS OF NAZARETH WITH THE HOLY GHOST and with power," &c.

That this act *manifested* Jesus in the character of the

Anointed Prince, the Son of God, is shown from the language of John the Baptist, John i. 31—34.—“And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit of God descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record, that this is the Son of God.”

CAN WE ASCERTAIN THE YEAR OF THE SAVIOR'S MANIFESTATION AS THE MESSIAH?

It was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. The Roman historians state that Augustus made Tiberius his colleague in the empire two or three years before his death. This act was confirmed by a decree of the senate. This took place either A.D. 11 or 12. The weight of evidence is in favor of the latter year. See Tacitus' Annals, B. 1., chap. 3. Velleius Paterculus, B. 2, sec. 99. Augustus died August 19th, A.D. 14. The era of his decease is fixed by a total eclipse of the moon, September 27th, which is noticed by Tacitus (Annals, B. I, chap. 28,) as having been seen by the mutinous legions in Pannonia, and which caused such a terror among the soldiers that they submitted to their officers. See Ferguson's Astronomy. Horne makes the following remarks on the text of Luke, which has been quoted:—“We learn from the Roman historians that the reign of Tiberius had *two* commencements: the *first*, when he was admitted to a place in the empire (but without the title of emperor,) in August, of the year 764, from the foundation of the city of Rome, three years before the death of Augustus; and the *second*, when he began to reign *alone* after that emperor's decease. It is from the *first* of these commencements that the *fifteenth* year mentioned by Saint Luke, is to be computed, who, as Tiberius did not assume the imperial title during the life of Augustus, makes use of a word, which properly marks the nature of the power exercised by Tiberius, namely, in the fifteenth year *tēs hégemonías*, “of the administration of Tiberius Cesar,” &c. Intro. B. I. p. 564.



## RESULT.

Commencing with the first day of Nisan, the first month, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, the prophetic period of seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and eighty-three full years, would reach to the first day of Nisan, A. D. 27. If, as has been already stated, these 483 years form a part of the longer period of 2300 years, the two periods must have the same commencement. By deducting the former we have a balance of 1817 years to be carried forward from Nisan 1st, A. D. 27, and we should reach Nisan 1st, 1844.

Such is the result, according to *modern* accuracy, still, as has already been shown, we must, to be consistent with scriptural usages, allow all the latitude in their estimation which comports with the practice of the Hebrews. The structure of the Jewish Calendar is such, that it is impossible to effect a coincidence between time reduced by it and by a *solar* calendar—nearer than the space of a month. Nor is this all, the Rabbinical Calendar which was adopted about three hundred years after the Christian era, makes the months commence about thirty days earlier than they did according to the ancient mode of reckoning. The author has examined this fact at length in an article published in the *Midnight Cry* of April 27, 1843, to which the reader is referred.

All attempts, therefore, to ascertain the *days, weeks, or months* for the cleansing of the sanctuary, must be useless, as they cannot have a basis which deserves any confidence.

In examining the proofs that the starting point is the seventh year of Artaxerxes, notice has been taken of the theory of Hengstenberg, who supposes, after an elaborate investigation, that the 69 weeks commence with the twentieth year B. C. 455. I have repeatedly read his dissertation on this subject, and while I do not say that it is impossible that he may be right, still the weight of evidence appears to me to preponderate in favor of the year B. C. 457. After all, the difference of *two years*, if we look at the long range of 2300, is but as “an hand’s breadth.”

It should not be forgotten that *moral* results have always especially been kept in view by our Creator in all that he has revealed to man. The Savior, in view of his coming in the clouds of heaven to judge the world in righteousness, apprised his disciples of the signs which were to precede that stupendous event, and warned them in the most impressive manner that they should watch and pray because they could not

know "the day or hour," although God could easily have made the very point of time known, and would have done so if it could have rendered them better prepared to meet him. He thus fixed their attention not on a point, but on a *space* of time. The same principle I believe has an influence in reference to all events whose arrival the spirit of prophecy has connected with the lapse of time. Hence, while the precise moment for an event is fixed, in the Divine Mind, revelation throws its light not on *the point*, but on *a line*, within which the point is located. When we reach the beginning of that line, the voice of Wisdom cries,—“ Watch and pray ! ”

In reference to the time in which we now live, there is an appropriateness in the Savior's counsel, which secures the solemn regard of every reflecting man : “ And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.”

N. N. W.

#### ARTICLE IV.

#### *The Downfall of Great Babylon.*

“ And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power ; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.”—Rev. xviii. 1—3.

*What is Babylon, and—  
What is the Fall of Babylon ?*

#### I.—WHAT IS BABYLON ?

By an examination of the scriptural testimony and predictions respecting the various forms under which Babylon is presented, we are led to the conclusion that it is *Antichrist*,—everything in this world opposed to, or varying from the spirit

of Christ. In other words, it is SATAN'S KINGDOM, warring with God's rightful claims upon man's obedience, and endeavoring to withhold from him the dominion of this earth.

The dominion of Satan in the earth commenced with the fall of man in Eden. God made man upright; but man rebelled against the Governor of the universe: the consequence was, the earth and all therein was *curst of God*; and death, and "him that had the power of death,"—Satan—received the dominion. From that day to the present, Satan's grand aim has been to perpetuate his dominion, and to defeat the plans of God by Christ, to restore this earth to its Eden state, and to redeem to himself a "peculiar people," "out of every kindred and tongue and people, and nation," who are to "reign on the earth," when Christ shall have redeemed the "purchased possession."

The efforts of Satan over the hearts of men were so successful, that after sixteen hundred years "the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually; and it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth." Therefore the Lord destroyed all flesh from off the face of the earth, save those preserved alive with Noah in the ark. "The world that then was being overflowed with water, perished."

No sooner had the remembrance of that mighty deluge began to pass from the minds of men, than wickedness began again to abound; and Satan, that he might concentrate and consolidate his power, and perhaps furnish a place of refuge for his subjects, in case of another flood, moved them to build a city and a tower. "And they said, Go to, let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach to heaven; and let us make a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." But the Lord confounded "their language," so that they could not "understand one another's speech." "So the Lord scattered them abroad" from the plain of Shinar, "upon the face of all the earth; and they left off to build the city; therefore is the name of it called BABEL.—Thus, Babel denotes "*confusion and disorder*," which is of the devil; for "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." This was the first great effort of Satan, after the flood, to concentrate the power of his kingdom in the world.

Though discomfited in this attempt, Satan did not relinquish his plan of consolidating a great Babylonian kingdom,

in which should be concentrated all the pride and pomp, the wealth and luxury, and power, of the world, with all that could tempt the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. He collected his scattered forces, and founded the empire of Babylon—the first great monarchy in the history of the world. This was Satan's first great work. The magnificence of its capital surpassed that of any other city of which we have any knowledge. It was spoken of by the inspired historians, as "the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." With its broad streets and brazen gates, its massive walls and hanging gardens, its towering temples and gorgeous palaces, it was at once a wonder of strength and beauty. "And wheresoever the children of men dwelt, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven" were given into the hands of its king, who was made "ruler over them all." Thus universal and splendid, Babylon was the great pattern of worldly dominion, and the antitype of all human supremacy, and greatness, and glory, from that day to the present; it embraced all that the souls of men lusted after, or which could wean their affections from Him who alone is worthy our supreme regard; it was the government of the whole world—an embodiment of Satan's kingdom in the earth. He not only reigned over the whole world, but even Israel became subject to this power. Because they did not walk in the statutes, nor keep the commandments of the Lord, the diadem was removed from Israel's prince, the crown taken from him, and their enemies reigned over them; the continuance of which was to be seven times, or 2520 years from Manasseh's captivity, about B. C. 677.

When Babylon had reached the greatness of its supremacy, the thought came into the mind of its king, Nebuchadnezzar, upon his bed, to know what should come to pass hereafter; and He that revealeth secrets made known to the king what should come to pass in the latter days, that he might know the thoughts of his heart. All the changes through which Satan's kingdom should pass, were symbolized by a great image, whose "head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." The interpretation of this was, that Nebuchadnezzar was the head of gold; that after the Babylonian empire another kingdom should arise, inferior to that, another third kingdom of brass, which should bear rule over the whole earth, and a fourth kingdom

which should be strong as iron, and which was to be divided into ten smaller kingdoms. When the empire of "the princes of the power of the air should have passed through all these changes, his kingdom was to fall, which was symbolized by a stone's smiting the image's feet and breaking it to pieces, so that the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold, were broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, which the wind carried away, so that no place was found for them; being succeeded by God's everlasting kingdom.

As we trace down the history of a fallen world, we find the dominion of Satan has existed under all these various forms; those kingdoms have arisen and passed away. The fate of Babylon was fixed when saying in her heart, "I sit as a queen and shall see no sorrow;" the Divine fiat, "Another kingdom shall arise after thee," had gone forth. And in the midst of a great feast, given by Belshazzar, to a thousand of his lords, to rejoice over the failure, as they supposed, of Jehovah's predicted time of its overthrow, the hand-writing was seen on the wall; Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans, was slain, and Darius, the Median, took the kingdom.

Thus Media-Persia, "the breast and arms of silver," succeeded to the supremacy, and took the place of Babylon as the representation of Satan's kingdom in the world. It was then the only true Babylon.

When Media-Persia had existed its appointed time, Grecia, the belly and thighs of brass, succeeded, as the head of Satan's empire; and, in its appointed time, Rome. As mistress of the world, Rome was the centre of the wealth, and refinement, the pride and pomp, and power of the earth. She was dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly—Satan's proudest work. It was the representation of everything which made Babylon what it was; and was the Babylon of John's time. Thus John was expressly told that the woman, on the scarlet colored beast, upon whose "forehead was a name written, mystery, **BABYLON THE GREAT**, the mother of harlots and **abominations of the earth**" is "that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." This city could have been none other than the city of Rome, the capital of the Roman empire, which was symbolized by the scarlet colored beast on which the woman, the city, sat. After the division of the Roman kingdom, the Papal horn succeeded to the supremacy, as the head of Satan's power, and became the Babylon

of the world. For 1260 years, the saints of the Most High were given into its hands, and they fell "by the sword and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days." But she, too, lost the supremacy; the ten kings—the toes of the image and horns of the beast—have hated her and made her naked, and burned her with fire; having received the kingdom which they gave unto the beast: "for God" did "put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God" should "be fulfilled."

Babylon, then, is now comprised in the present kingdoms of the world—"the people, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues," "the many nations" which John saw on which "the woman" sat—"the kings of the earth," over which "that great city," Rome, reigned. Babylon now not only comprises all earthly power and dominion, but embraces everything which is Anti-christian in its tendencies, or which will be gathered out of the world, when "the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire."

It includes everything which the heart of man can lust after;—not only its fame and honor and glory, but "the merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner of vessels of ivory, and all manner of vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." Therefore our Savior commanded his disciples not to "lay up" for themselves "treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal;" "for after all these things do the Gentiles seek." But this is the last form of Babylon—of Satan's kingdom in the earth: for, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," and "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms."

## II. WHAT IS THE FALL OF BABYLON?

If the preceding position is correct, it follows that the fall of Babylon is the end of Satan's supremacy in the earth,

when Michael will stand up to reign, to "bruise Satan under his feet shortly," and to "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend." This is shown, both by the chronology of the event, and by the result.

1. *The Chronology of the Event.* We learn by Rev. xviii. 1, that it is to be when another angel shall come down from heaven, having GREAT POWER, and who will LIGHTEN THE EARTH WITH HIS GLORY. This can be none other than MICHAEL, the Archangel, who will be revealed "in flaming fire;" who will come "as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west;" whose "eyes" are "as a flame of fire," "and his countenance as the sun shineth in his strength;" who was "clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow was upon his head, and his face was as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire." He it is that will cry "mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird;" which will be literally true, when the restraining influences of the Holy Spirit shall be withdrawn from this earth. "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her," (the spirit of Anti-Christ) "and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies."

In Rev. xiv. 8, the chronology points to the same time. One angel flies "in the midst of heaven," proclaiming "the hour of his judgment is come;" which will not be past till the Lord shall come to "judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." Then follows "another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen! that great city! because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." This is the same angel previously brought to view who *lightens the earth with his glory*. Then there immediately follows a third angel, who sentences the subjects of Satan to "drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation;" "and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." After this sentence is pronounced, on a "white cloud," there sits one "like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle," who reaps "the harvest of the earth"—the righteous; and another angel gathers "the vine of the earth,"—the wicked

—and casts them into the great wine-press of the wrath of God.

The order of events is described the same in the 19th chapter, only in different language. Instead of another angel's crying to him that sat upon the cloud to reap the harvest of the earth; another voice from heaven is heard saying, "COME OUT OF HER MY PEOPLE, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues: for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double." Thus when the wicked are to experience the fierceness of "the wine of the wrath of God," the righteous will all receive the invitation to meet their Lord in the air, and will not suffer for the sins of the wicked, nor receive of their plagues. The chronology of the Fall of Babylon, therefore, proves it to be at the end of the world, when Satan's supremacy shall cease at the coming of Christ.

2. *The Consequences of Babylon's fall.* The predicted consequences of the fall of Babylon also proves it to be the end of the world—the age that now is. "How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow," are to be given her, "for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her. And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication, and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off"—[hiding "themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains,"]—"for fear of her torment, saying, Alas, alas! that great city, Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come. And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth her merchandize any more." The merchants "which were made rich by her shall stand afar off,"—[endeavoring to hide themselves "from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb,"]—"for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing, and saying, Alas, alas! that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and



pearls ! For in one hour so great riches is come to nought. And every ship-master, and all the company in ships, and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stood afar off, and cried when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, What city is like unto this great city ! And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and wailing, saying, Alas, alas ! that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea by reason of her costliness ! for in one hour is she made desolate. Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets : for God hath avenged you on her. And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great mill-stone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee ; and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee ; and the sound of a mill-stone shall be heard no more at all in thee ; and the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee ; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee : for thy merchants were the great men of the earth ; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth."

Thus *all* the merchants of the *earth*, and *every ship-master*, and *all* the company in ships, and sailors, and *as many as trade by sea*, are *all* called to weep over her ; and *no man* buyeth their merchandize *any more* : such extensive consequences can make Babylon include nothing less than Satan's entire kingdom in the whole world.

As the fall of ancient Babylon was the end of the seventy years' captivity of the Jews, so the fall of its great anti-type will be the end of the seven times that the Gentiles are to reign over God's Israel. And as the fall of Babylon was the signal of Israel's deliverance, so will the end of the world be the deliverance of the redeemed—the righteous living, and those who sleep in Jesus, who are waiting for the redemption of their body.

And then will be fulfilled, in connection with other predictions of the overthrow of Babylon, which carry us down to the end of the world, Isaiah xiii. 1—15 :—

" *The burden of Babylon, which Isaiah the son of Amoz did see :—Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt*

the voice unto them, shake the hand, that they may go into the gates of the nobles. I have commanded my sanctified ones, I have also called my mighty ones for mine anger, even them that rejoice in my highness. The noise of a multitude in the mountains, like as of a great people ; a tumultuous noise of the kingdoms of nations gathered together : the Lord of hosts mustereth the host of the battle. They come from a far country, from the end of heaven, even the Lord, and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole land. Howl ye ; for the day of the Lord is at hand ; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. Therefore shall all hands be faint, and every man's heart shall melt ; and they shall be afraid ; pangs and sorrows shall take hold of them ; they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth : they shall be amazed at one another ; their faces shall be as flames. Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate ; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light : the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity ; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold ; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger. And it shall be as the chased roe, and as a sheep that no man taketh up : they shall every man turn to his own people, and flee every one into his own land. Every one that is found shall be thrust through ; and every one that is joined unto them shall fall by the sword."

From the fulfillment of the prophecies, the signs of the times, and the termination of the prophetic periods, we must be near Babylon's appointed end, when, as Isaiah said of old Babylon, " Her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." Says our Savior, " Surely, I come quickly ; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

B.

## ARTICLE V.

*Our Position as to Time—The Prophetic Periods—  
Future Labors.*

IN the passing by of the Jewish year, our friends and the public will, and have a right to expect from us some exposition of the position we occupy. And this we are as free to give. It has never been any part of our purpose to withhold from the public any of our views respecting the future, or the difficulties which may be before us. And we therefore fully and frankly admit that all our expected and published time, has passed: the Jewish year, civil and ecclesiastical, in which we expected the Lord, has expired, and the Savior has not been revealed; and we would not disguise the fact at all, that we were *mistaken* in fixing the precise time of the termination of the prophetic periods.

In view of the present time, it has been repeatedly predicted that we should either extend the time to some new period, or throw away our Bibles and turn Infidels: but in this, those who have thus prophesied, have prophesied falsely—false prophets have arisen in these last days.

We have never been able to find any other time for the termination of the prophetic periods than the Jewish year now past: nor do we now find any other. The only event we can find, from which to reckon the *seven times*, or 2500 years that the Gentiles were to reign over God's people, is the captivity of Manasseh, which the best chronologers place B. C. 677, and since which the Jews have never been an independent nation. The only event we can find from which to date the great Jubilee, or 2450 years that the land was to keep its Sabbaths, is at the commencement of the seventy years' captivity in Babylon, when Jehoiakim was carried captive, and which the best chronologers place B. C. 607. The only event we can find, from which to reckon the 2300 days, is the going forth of the decree to restore Jerusalem, from which the seventy weeks are dated, given by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh year of his reign; and which the best chronologers pin down to B. C. 457. And the only event we can find from which to date the 1335 days is the succession of the supremacy of papacy, to that of paganism in the Roman empire, which the best chronologists place about

A.D. 508. Reckoning the several periods from those respective dates, they can extend only to about A. D. 1843 ; and as we can find no new dates for the various events from which the respective periods are reckoned, we can find no new point for their termination ; and therefore we can extend the time to no new period, unless some error can be shown in our standard chronologers.

In the second place, we shall not throw away our Bibles or turn Infidels. We have not followed "cunningly devised fables" respecting "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ ;" but have the testimony of those who were "eye-witnesses of his Majesty ;" and in addition to that, "a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed" until the Lord shall come. Although our reckoning is out, yet as our chart has brought us so near the heavenly country that we are within soundings, we shall continue on, looking for the Lord such little while as human computation of time may have varied from an exact chronology—the same as any able seaman, when his reckoning is up, would continue on his course, till the blue hills of the expected country should break upon his view.

We believe, as ever, that the visions of Daniel and John, as interpreted by *all the standard Protestant commentators*, reveal to us the most prominent events in this world's history to the consummation of all things, and that history shows a literal fulfillment of all that has been predicted to precede the Advent, so that it is to be the next event, and speedily to be ushered in. We also believe that it is proved by the signs of the times, predicted in the Scriptures as precursors of that event. We also believe that the several prophetic periods, which we have supposed would terminate about A. D. 1843, respectively commenced at the several events from which we have reckoned them, and all terminate in the fulness of times, at the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom ; and we admit that we have been as much mistaken in the date of those several events, or in the computation of time since their occurrence, as the vision may be delayed beyond the year of their apparent termination : in this mistake, however, we have erred with the standard chronologers and historians of modern times, who have been our authority on chronological points.

Having passed the point of the apparent termination of the prophetic periods, we are placed in a position, which God

foresaw his children would be placed in, at the end of the vision; and for which he made provision, by the prophet Habakkuk, (ii. 1—3,) when he says, “I will stand upon my watch, and sit upon my tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved,” or as it reads in the margin “*argued with.*” “And the Lord answered me and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time,” [the seven times] “but at the end [of the prophetic periods] it shall speak and not lie: though it tarry,” [beyond their apparent termination] “wait for it; because it will surely come,” [in the fulness of the prophet times, beyond which,] “it will not tarry.”

That this admonition has reference to the present time is evident from Paul’s quotation of it in Hebrews x. 36—39. “For we have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul.”

We believe that we are occupying that period spoken of by our Savior, when the Bridegroom tarries—Matthew xxv. 5, to which the kingdom of heaven should be likened when “that evil servant [there having been an apparent failure in the time] shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to *eat and drink with the drunken,*” and the Lord should come in a day when he looketh not for him.

We believe that we are now occupying that period of time spoken of by Peter, 2 Epistle ii. 3, of the false teachers, when the “judgment *now* of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not,” who were “privily to bring in damnable heresies.” These Peter says were to be, even as were the false prophets when the Scriptures were indited. As, therefore, they of the house of Israel said, “the days were prolonged and every vision faileth,” (Ezekiel xii. 23) so must there have been a time, when there would be an apparent passing by of the time that the scoffers (Peter iii. 4) might inquire, “Where is the promise of his coming?” and flatter themselves that “all things continue as they were from the creation.”

We believe it was in view of such an apparent tarrying of the vision that the apostle James said, "Be patient, therefore, brethren unto the coming of the Lord, be ye also patient; establish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh," and "Behold the Judge standeth at the door."

And we believe it was in anticipation of the passing by of the expected time that our Savior admonished us, in the 12th of Luke, "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that *wait* for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto him immediately." To *wait* implies a passing by of the time; for till that we do not *wait*. Therefore our Lord adds:—"Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord *when he cometh* shall find watching."

As our time has thus passed by—the civil year having terminated last October, and the ecclesiastical, with the new moon in April, we are now prepared to tell the world what we shall do—a question which has often been asked. We intend to hold fast the integrity of our faith without wavering; and not cast away our confidence which hath great recompense of reward. We intend to continue to comfort one another with the words of the coming of Christ, who will come and will not tarry. We shall continue to believe God's word, in its literal acceptation: for not one jot or tittle of all that is written therein will fail.

We shall continue, God willing, to proclaim, Behold the Bridegroom cometh! go ye out to meet him; and the hour of his judgment is come! and we trust we shall not fail to continue to cry aloud to the world and the church to arouse themselves from their songs of "peace," and to listen to God's overtures of mercy. We intend to continue waiting and watching for the coming of the Lord, believing that it is just upon us; and we hope to continue faithful to the cause of truth, ever ready to confess or forsake any errors, when pointed out, or to receive any truth in accordance with the word of God. By so doing, we believe we shall soon unite when the Lord shall come, in that response when "it shall be said in that day, Lo this is our God; we have *waited* for him, and he will save us. This is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation," those being blessed who *wait* and come to the end of the days.

As our time has elapsed, and we have no other specified

time in the future, but wishing to live, and induce others to live, in continual readiness and constant expectation of the Lord's coming, we shall know that all who oppose us for so doing, have no sympathy for the Lord's coming. With those who are looking for the Lord, or loving his appearing, we have no controversy. But with those who put far off the day of the Lord, and say in their hearts my Lord delayeth his coming, or deny the resurrection of the body, and a future judgment, we can hold no Christian fellowship: for those who assume such positions, show that they have no love for Christ's appearing; and teach men contrary to the admonitions of Christ and his apostles; that we should take heed to ourselves lest at any time our hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and so that day come upon us unawares.

---

### THE ADVENT.

AND now a redd'ning light at distance glar'd  
O'er the horrizon! and they see the sign  
In heaven of the Son of man! the cross,  
Irradiated, blaz'd terrific light.  
One rode on clouds, with fiery rainbows girt,  
Cinctur'd by thousand and ten thousand saints;  
And now a thund'ring roar (the trump of God)  
Astounds all nature, and awakes to life the dead  
Of earth and sea, blazing with terrific light.  
Guilty and guiltless men, by myriads stand  
Before the throne!—They pass to right and left!—  
The sheep and goats!—A solemn silence reigns.

And now the heavens, as a scroll involv'd,  
Departed with a noise, and bick'ring flames  
Flagrates th' expiring world; the elements  
Were chang'd, and from the ashes rose sublime  
New heav'ns, new earth; illum'd with brighter light  
Than this of earthly suns, the light of God!  
And, lo! the new Jerusalem descends,  
From heav'n, and high uprears her walls of gold,  
That burn with jasper, and all living gems.

## THE REVIEW.

---

*Remarks on the Book of Daniel, in regard to the four kingdoms, especially the fourth; the '2300 days;' the seventy weeks; and the events predicted in the last three chapters.* By IRAH CHASE, D. D. *Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Newton Theological Institution.* Boston. 18mo. pp. 84.

AMONG the remarkable developments which have been made by the agency of "Millerism," the deficiencies of our great theological leaders, in qualifications most essential to their office, have forced themselves upon our attention. They were, evidently, taken by surprise, and were entirely unprepared for the emergency. We have heard a story of the Poet Laureate of Lord Timothy Dexter, that upon entering a house on the approach of a violent tempest, and being called upon by the female inmates, who were much terrified by the thunder and lightning, to offer prayer, the poet replied, "I don't know but *one* prayer, and that is *good for nothing* in such a case as this." So with the guardians of our religion in this case. They had no forms or notes for the occasion. The Bible, as it had been generally understood, was all against them; but the mischief was working, and something must be done.

If the community had been agitated by the sudden appearance of a comet, or if the visitation had been an army of rats, the bull of the Pope, in such cases made and provided, might have been used. But a strange demon was at large, and in full possession of the community; how to effect an exorcism, and allay the trouble, was the great question to be settled. Some of the great men stood forth, willing to do what they could to restore quiet, and most of the pulpits and presses of the land responded, but still the mischief went on. Their first attempts appear to have been as unsuccessful as those of their predecessors, in a case of old, and the regret was expressed in very similar terms,—"*Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world have gone after him!*" Of course, new and more powerful incantations were required.

We doubt not a large portion of the Christian community are satisfied that the remedy in all these cases has been worse than the disease. In reference to the work before us this is eminently the case. It "*out-Herods Herod.*"



Professor Chase sustains a similar relation to the Baptist, as that of Professor Stuart to the Orthodox church, and is one of those instruments which Providence has permitted, in its inscrutable operations, to poison the theology of the communion to which he belongs with the profane and deadly spirit of *Neology*.

His "Remarks" are intended to quiet "the minds that have been greatly agitated, by an expectation of the speedy fulfillment of certain predictions in the Book of Daniel." And nothing certainly could be more happily adapted to accomplish the work, if we could persuade ourselves that he has done what he attempted to do. For, according to our Professor, there is nothing of the Book of Daniel which remains to be fulfilled, no part of it looked so far into the future even as *the birth of Christ*, except the ninth chapter, which contains the 70 weeks.

The work may be considered a striking illustration of modern "*hermeneutics*;" which means, in plain English, *the art of charging the God of wisdom and truth with folly and falsehood, according to the popular theological forms*. And it is this feature of the work, as we shall show, which constitutes its fatal character.

If any one expects to find anything in the "Remarks" to call forth his admiration, either on account of any great truth developed, or remarkable ability in presenting what the writer appears to be aiming at, he will be disappointed. In all that shows the power of the writer's mind, so far as the construction of his arguments, and defence of his position is concerned, it may be ranked among "the wonders of littleness." No verification of "Millerism" is needed to seal its fate. No favoritism could save it.

Nor would any man value it for any truth which it contains. Neology cannot endure the truth. All our *divines* (!) who come under its influence are at once so much affected with what they deem to be the *vice* of appropriating to ourselves *too much* of the word of God, that they run into the opposite *virtue* and endeavor to show how *little* of it belongs to us. Judaism buried up the word of God with the traditions of the elders. Popery has robbed the church of this treasure by law. Neology perpetrates the same crime, by stripping the Bible of its divinity. Professor Chase has clearly placed himself with that class of *divines*.

These, we are aware, are grave charges, and the proof will be expected. Most gratifying would it be to us, if the proof were not so abundant. We remark, then, that the events contemplated by the prophet, and the field in which these events were to become history, as *he* interprets the prophecy, are altogether at variance with the clearest testimony of the word of God. "*And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive UNTIL THE TIMES OF RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, which God hath spoken by the mouth of ALL HIS HOLY PROPHETS since the world began.*"—Acts iii. 20, 21.

Here we have the testimony of an inspired apostle, that "the restitution," of which he had made mention, is spoken of by "*all the prophets*,"

and that it is not to take place until Jesus Christ leaves the heaven which has received him. Need we to ask whether Daniel is to be classed among the "holy prophets?" That question being settled, he must have spoken of this restitution.

Now mark Professor Chase's application of those portions of his prophecy, which all must admit refer to the times of restitution, if he has spoken of them at all.

"It was in the days of these kings, (the successors of Alexander,) implied and predicted in the second chapter, that the God of heaven would set up or cause to stand, a kingdom which was not to be destroyed; that is, he would preserve, sustain, and gloriously vindicate the true religion, the worship connected with the promises made to the patriarchs and prophets, and with the coming of the Messiah, in whom all the nations were to be blessed. Antiochus Epiphanes might persecute and threaten to destroy the people and the worship of the Most High. . . . All this might be done, but the true and eternal God would interpose, and execute judgment for the oppressed. 'I beheld,' as it is briefly expressed in the 21st and 22d verses of the 7th chapter, 'I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High.' The interposition is here expressed in a few words, and some of its important consequences are set forth more fully and vividly in the glowing vision, described in a preceding part of this seventh chapter, from the ninth verse to the fourteenth:—'I beheld, till thrones were placed, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. The judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed.'"—Pp. 27, 28, 29.

We need not add a word after this specimen of the Professor's presumption, in interpreting "the Book of Daniel." He could as readily blot out the doctrine of a *final and general judgment* from the word of God. His quotation from the eighteenth Psalm, instead of helping the case, would only add to the impiety of his view of the Book of Daniel. For, to say nothing of the argument which might be drawn from the last and other verses of that Psalm, to show that it had a higher application than to David, on his own supposition, the prophecy, to make the cases analogous, must be a mere poetic history of past events. That he supposes the Psalm to be.

Having, in this unauthorized and impious manner, measured the field by which the visions of the prophet are to be limited, and *wrested* the prophecy in order to apply it to events so comparatively insignificant—so much so indeed, that there is very little reason to suppose they are even referred to specifically at all—he proceeds to arrange his facts, not to say *invent* them, and frame his arguments, and meet objections, and to moralize, all in harmony with his design and plan of the work. And no words which we might employ could add to the evidence, everywhere apparent in the work itself, that the poor man had entered upon a task which he knew not how to perform.

In reference to the historical facts, by the aid of which he endeavors to use up, not explain, those portions of the prophecy which must be disposed of, we would simply remark, that if Mr. Miller had been guilty of half the forced statements of history, or half the fancies which are found in this work, his whole theory would have sunk into oblivion, long before this time, under the weight of its own absurdity.

The first exhibition of legerdemain, in showing up the facts of history, is put forth in making out a fourth kingdom that will meet his plan of interpretation. For, unfortunately for our Professor, three of the kingdoms in the grand series are described in such a manner, that the torturing and contracting process must be inflicted, if at all, just at this point in the inquiry—"the four kingdoms,

#### ESPECIALLY THE FOURTH."

The first is named to be "Babylon,"—the second, "Media and Persia"—the third, "Grecia." Any quibbling of "hermeneutics" which would interfere with the self-interpreted prophecy, so far, would be fatal to itself. And, farther, the prophecy is so very clear in its sketches of this *fourth* kingdom also, that it must make a very large draught upon a man's ingenuity to find any other but the true fourth kingdom to answer to the description.

The author of the "Remarks" begins this work by showing, in some half dozen pages, what no man ever doubted, that "the kingdom of Syria," one of the four divisions of Alexander's empire, was "*a kingdom*." Pp. 15—19, seq.

Now the prophet has distinctly predicted that the empire of Alexander should be divided into four kingdoms. These were indicated by the *four heads* of the leopard, vii. 6; and the portion of the 8th, which refers to the same fact, reads as follows:—"And the rough goat is the king of *Grecia*; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the *first king*. Now that being broken whereas *four stood up for it*, *FOUR KINGDOMS shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power*."

This division of his empire is one of the Professor's "*fourth king-*"

doms." "What is said respecting the ten horns of the fourth beast in Daniel vii. 7, 8, corresponds with the facts as they occurred in the kingdom of the Greeks, that is, by way of eminence, in the dynasty established by Seleucus." P. 24.

After presenting these "facts," in which he makes out ten kingdoms, or that number of "kings, aspirants and usurpers," he proceeds :

"So exact is the correspondence between what is said of the ten horns of the fourth beast, and what occurred in the kingdom of the Greeks." p. 26.

Not to be too severe upon our interpreter, we may remark, in passing, that, if the number of horns had been equal to the mysterious number of the Revelator's image beast, as "usurpers" and "aspirants" are always plenty enough, there could be no difficulty at all in making out a fulfillment—666 could be found as easily as 10.

But the fourth kingdom of the prophecy was to be a universal kingdom. Its extent is as strongly marked as its divisions, character or fate. And it must strike every one, on reading the prophecy, as a little singular that God, (we ask pardon of Dr. C.) the "Jewish prophet," should speak of a fourth division of a universal kingdom, as a universal kingdom itself.

Ah, reader, perhaps you are not aware of the power of genius. Genius is everything in such a case. There are more fourth kingdoms than one to be found in the world. It is the pleasure of the Professor that all the divisions of the Greek Empire should be "the fourth kingdom," in order to meet that point.

"Words could hardly express more strongly the termination of Alexander's empire. And if this terminated with himself, it must not be confounded with that of his Greek successors. His empire, as such, stood pre-eminent and alone. It was the third. Hence theirs was the fourth. It had passed over directly and entirely to them. And viewed thus, as a whole, in their hands, it corresponds well with the prediction in Daniel vii. 23. "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces." Pp. 22, 23.

Like the single division of Alexander's kingdom, which fell to Seleucus, he assures us that the four divisions collectively, "was, as it is repeatedly denominated in the Maccabees and other ancient writings, the kingdom of the Greeks." P. 24.

This done, and the grand point, our author would have us believe, is settled. Let no man have the presumption to doubt any more. If two fourth kingdoms are not enough to make out an "exact" fulfillment, don't complain : our Professor can find as many as may be demanded ; if you will only allow him to keep at a becoming distance from our own times. But let him state the result of the historical inquiry for himself ; it will be a great accommodation to him, and save further trouble.

"Here is a kingdom expressly named by the sacred writer himself, distinct from that of Alexander, and immediately succeeding his ; a kingdom

*possessing the characteristics predicted as belonging to the fourth; a kingdom peculiarly prominent and terrible to the Jews, as threatening their holy religion with utter extermination, at a most dark and perilous period before the coming of the Messiah. Why, then, should we look elsewhere for the fourth kingdom?"—P. 24.*

Who, after this, would think of "looking elsewhere for the fourth kingdom?" Especially since our Professor has admonished us that "if we attempt, as many have done, to apply it to the Roman empire, the application becomes *exceedingly arbitrary*," p. 26. The Roman Empire was a small affair compared with his fourth kingdom, and the testimony of history in reference to the former is nothing but "extraordinary panegyric," the testimony of St. Luke to the contrary, notwithstanding.

However, we confess we have strong misgivings about this application of the prophecy of the fourth kingdom, though this will not surprise the world, as we have become such notorious sinners against *modern* light and learning.

Not to dwell upon the fact that the Dr. is an *ex-parte* witness in the case, and his "Remarks" an undisguised effort, in what the lawyers would term *special pleading*, to make out a case, when the facts, the evidence, the law, common sense, and every thing else in heaven and earth (we cannot except the other place) are against him; there are several very simple questions which present themselves, just as naturally, by the subject before us, as the innocent victim of torture would ask, "*Sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?*"

Now the prophecy says distinctly of this fourth beast, that "*it had ten horns*," and "*the little horn came up among them*," implying their existence all at one time. Before this little horn "*three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots*. And when judgment is executed upon the little horn, *the beast is slain, and his body given to the burning flame*. Daniel vii. 11, "*I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame*." The interpretation is equally plain: "*The fourth beast is the fourth kingdom upon earth, and the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise, and another shall rise after them, and he shall subdue THREE KINGS*." Daniel vii. 21, 22, "*I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom*."

These are the questions which occur. If the fourth kingdom, represented by the fourth beast, consisted of the *four divisions* of Alexander's kingdom, why should the horns or kings be confined to *one* division of his kingdom? If that *one* division is the fourth kingdom, did the little horn come up *among* the ten horns or kings, specified by Dr. Chase, (granting

the "usurpers and aspirants," by which only he can make out the number, were kings) any more than he come up among the *twenty-three*, or more kings of the same dynasty? Is there not a little too much *fancy* in the supposition that the prophecy speaks of plucking up horns which were not horns, and subduing kings which were not kings? Is it not a little remarkable that the little horn should make war and prevail against the saints till the judgment of the Ancient of days, which took place at the overthrow of Antiochus, when the beast was to be destroyed and his body given to the burning flame, and that the beast should exist at least a hundred years after that event, as truly as that time?

And should we not add to the other rare virtues of Dr. Chase, that of astonishing *faith*, since there are very few who *can* believe that the kingdom of the little horn of the fourth beast, was the beast himself, or that one of the "four horns"; of the Grecian goat, or even all the four, are to be considered a "distinct" kingdom, in the grand series, from that represented by the goat?

The prophecy says, this little horn of Daniel viii. should "*destroy the mighty and the holy people.*" If Dr. Chase is right, is it not very remarkable that the holy people should *not* be destroyed, as a body politic, until more than two hundred and thirty years after the little horn, who was to destroy them, was himself destroyed? Nay, is it not still more wonderful, that although this little horn was to destroy the mighty and the holy people, that they should triumph over *him* in such a very signal manner? And is it not remarkable that the saints have not yet obtained possession of the kingdom? And is it not passing strange, that this interposition, or judgment of the Ancient of days upon the little horn, should be executed as history informs us, by important sections of the beast itself?

And, finally, for there is no end to the questions which arise in such a case, Was it not bad enough to commit such horrible butchery upon this poor beast, in order to get him into the desirable shape, without the additional barbarity of making use of the amputated parts to slaughter the bleeding trunk?

This is the manner in which the testimony of "Daniel the prophet," which, according to its own repeated declarations, referred to "*the latter days,*" and looked to the scenes of the judgment, and the setting up of the everlasting kingdom; and, according to the statement of an inspired apostle, extended to the "restitution of all things," which is to follow the return of Jesus Christ from the heaven which has received him—in this manner his testimony is made null and void, by the scoffing spirit of our times, which puts darkness for light and evil for good!

The next step in the work of our Professor is to *defend* his interpretation of the fourth kingdom, which, in its practical results is the interpretation of the whole prophecy. He begins with the old and unanswerable arguments contained in the works of Newton and Hengstenberg; and the manner in which he meets them cannot fail to remind one of the good

woman who attempted to repel the waves of the Atlantic, which had invaded her dwelling, with her broom.

We shall not notice these arguments, as our readers are familiar with them, though we are glad the book contains such an antidote to its own poison. And an antidote they will be, with all those who read it, who do not "love darkness rather than light."

He next labors very hard to show that the authority of some of the ancient writers are in favor of his interpretation of the fourth kingdom. He seems, indeed, to be much more anxious to find something among the Jewish "Paraphrasts" and "Targum-makers" in his favor, than to reconcile his novelties with the views of the apostles, the fathers, the reformers, or the evangelical Protestants of more modern times. But not a fragment of any thing can be found in his favor. Josephus and others were so taken up with the affairs of their own times, that they could not see the true bearing of the prophecy. He thinks some of them spoke *almost* as he wanted them to, and if they had only hinted that "the kingdom of the Greeks," in any of its modifications might have been the fourth kingdom of Daniel, they would have been wonderfully "great men," "wiser than Daniel," without a figure. But as it now is, they are to be looked upon as ignorant fanatics who had their "vision filled too exclusively with the events of their own day," or a contemptible set of cowards.

We might select from this part of the "Remarks" several specimens of the author's logical powers. One or two must suffice. He argues that the Seleucidæ and Lagidæ *should* be considered the fourth kingdom, in part at least, because they "*were connected so closely with the Jews*;" but, the Romans *could not* be the fourth kingdom, because they *did not conquer the whole of the Babylonian and Persian empires*. Compare pp. 20, 22, and 35.

A more interesting specimen is contained in his remarks upon the testimony of Josephus. After weighing what the learned historian has said of Daniel's prophecies, (in which, by the way, he placed among "things in the future," what our Professor places *prior* to the days of Josephus,) he thinks the historian left the subject "about as clear and about as dark as he found it;" and expresses his views of Josephus as follows:—

"This learned writer may have been unsettled in his own views respecting some of the prophecies, and especially respecting what was indicated by the stone cut out of the mountain. Sometimes he probably perceived a meaning which he was unwilling to utter, lest he should offend the Romans."

That is to say, it requires *courage* to interpret prophecy. Josephus applied the fourth kingdom of Daniel to the Romans, so far as he dared; if he had possessed the courage of our Professor, he would have expressed himself more fully, and no doubt would have applied the fourth beast of Daniel to the Romans, *just as the Millerites do*.

So "the book of Daniel," so far as it relates to the fourth kingdom, has failed entirely of answering any purpose. The generation "to whom the understanding of the prophecy was the most important," according to our interpreter, with all their self-appropriating spirit, do not appear to have dreamed that it belonged to them. Well, perhaps it was for Dr. Chase to verify, in a peculiar sense, this notable phrase in the prophecy, "*the wise shall understand.*"

He next passes to the "deeply interesting inquiry" concerning

#### THE 2300 DAYS.

Perhaps we cannot better present the Professor's views of this portion of the prophecy, so as to exhibit at the same time his *boldness* and *ingenuity*, than by giving *his* reading of the text in connection with *the common reading*.

#### DR. CHASE.

"A deeply interesting inquiry is presented in the thirteenth verse of the eighth chapter of Daniel: 'Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint who was speaking, How long shall be the vision?' that is, How long shall that continue which the vision indicates, "concerning the daily sacrifice and the desolating impiety, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?"

In the next verse we have the reply: "And he said to me, Unto two thousand and three hundred times of sacrifice, evening and morning; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.'" p. 57.

#### DANIEL THE PROPHET.

"Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, HOW LONG shall be THE VISION concerning THE DAILY [sacrifice] AND THE TRANSGRESSION OF DESOLATION, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, UNTO TWO THOUSAND AND THREE HUNDRED DAYS; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Daniel viii. 13, 14.

[See the literal translation, by N. N. Whiting, p. 100 of the Shield.]

This will speak for itself. Professor Chase knows very well that there is no authority for the insertion of the word *sacrifice* in the text at all. But as the Professor thinks that "if we bear in mind what precedes, respecting the perpetual sacrifice, and instead of the specific terms, *evenings* and *mornings*, employ what in this connection is an equivalent, but only a more general expression, *times of sacrifice*, the ambiguity ceases, and all is plain," we may be pardoned if we demur in a few words that this so "plain" and *unambiguous* after all.

1. Then we pronounce it an unauthorized and unpardonable violation of all the principles of interpretation, to assume that when the Holy Ghost expresses to us *the duration of "the vision,"* the period given is to be applied to particular events, which, although comprehended in the vision, are but little more, compared with the whole field embraced, than one day is to a thousand years.



2. Granting all the assumption claims, for the moment, we call the attention of our readers to the wonderful *plainness* which our interpreter has discovered in the case. The period is not given in *plain* terms; but it is 2300 "*evening morning*," (this is the literal reading,) which mean, *first*, "*evenings and mornings*," which mean, *second*, "*evening and morning sacrifices*," which are to be understood to express, *third*, 1150 days, which "*the fulfillment*" shows to be, *fourth*, three years—"1090 *days*," or three years—1063 *days*," but, *fifth*, as "*the period predicted*" covers the period occupied "*in the fulfillment*," "*and somewhat more*," as to anything that appears in the history brought forward, our interpreter attempts to make this "*plain*," as follows:—

"Respecting the precise day when that fragment commenced, when the daily sacrifice was actually taken away, the histories which have been transmitted to us, are silent."—P. 72.

So this plain case of *fulfilled* prophecy is made out at last, by what our undoubtedly competent Professor is pleased to think is undoubtedly true.

Well may the author of the "*Remarks*," attempt to divert attention from his absurdities by animadverting upon the *double sense* expositors. If they have erred on one hand, he has erred as far on the other as *nonsense* is from *common sense*. His interpretation of this prophetic period has given a new meaning to the words of the prophet, in his appeal to the Deity—"Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself."

He passes next to remark upon

#### THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

"In the ninth chapter is recorded the prediction of the seventy weeks. This was about fifteen years after the vision mentioned in the eighth chapter. The subject, then, may well be considered as being distinct from the one there presented. Indeed, the ninth chapter is a record complete in itself; and it seems to have no particular connection either with the parts by which it is preceded, or with that by which it is followed."—P. 73.

The design of his remarks on the Book of Daniel required him to say nothing more upon the 9th chapter than we have quoted; and all that he has said in addition to that, is of the most common-place character imaginable. We have in this case an exhibition of his utter want of good sense, both in saying so much more than his purpose demanded, and in making the remark we have quoted.

The 9th chapter then "*is complete in itself*," is it!

"Aye, there 's the rub!"

If it were left to assertions, made with the greatest disregard of its plainest statements, to dispose of it, nothing more need be said. And, without referring to the great and worthy names who view it in a different light, or dwelling upon the many arguments which naturally lead us to a different

result, we call attention to one fact, which shows that there is a *necessary* "connection" between the seventy weeks of the 9th chapter, and something else which "precedes or follows it," called "*the vision*." It is found in the 24th verse. "*Seventy weeks are determined, or 'cut off,' upon thy people . . . . TO SEAL UP THE VISION,*" &c.

Now there are but two significations of the phrase "to seal up." They are, first, "*to make secret*," and second, "*to make sure*." We care not now in which of these significations the phrase is supposed to be used. That is not the point now before us. Let the signification be what it may, it shows that the "prediction of the seventy weeks," necessarily relates to something beyond itself, called "*the vision*," in reference to which it performs this work, "*to seal up*."

To talk of its sealing up itself, is as much of an absurdity, as to suppose that Josephus was so much afraid of *the Romans*, that he refrained from telling the world that he thought the fourth kingdom of Daniel was "*the kingdom of the Greeks*."

It is no more proper to say that the 9th of Daniel "is complete in itself," than it would be to say that a map, which was designed to show the relation of Massachusetts to the United States, referred to nothing but Massachusetts. It is no more complete in itself, than a bond given in security for a note, or some other document to which it refers, is complete in itself; and we doubt if there is a school-boy of fourteen, in the land, of ordinary capacity, who would not, on reading this ninth chapter, with an understanding of the clause before us, decide that it referred to something distinct from itself, called the vision.

What vision it is, there is no difficulty in determining. It naturally and obviously refers to the vision which was not fully explained to Daniel, and to which Gabriel calls his attention in the preceding verse—the *vision of the 8th chapter*. Daniel tells us that Gabriel was commanded to make him understand that vision, (viii. 16.) This was not done fully at the interview connected with the vision; he is, therefore, sent to give Daniel the needed "*skill and understanding*" to explain its "*meaning*," by communicating to him "*the prediction of the seventy weeks*."

How full of noble intelligence is the view of the learned Doctor Hales, to which we might add other distinguished names, upon this important portion of the Book of Daniel, compared with the unauthorized and bold remarks of our Professor.

Dr. Hales renders Daniel ix. 21—23, 'Yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel whom I had seen in the *foregoing vision*, (viii. 16,) flying swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation, and informed me, and spake to me and said: O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee understanding and information. At the beginning of thy supplications THE ORACLE came forth; and I am come to tell thee [His response,] for thou art greatly beloved. Therefore consider the matter and understand the vision.'

The 27th verse he renders, "But one week shall establish a [new] covenant with many; and half of the week shall abrogate the [daily] sacrifice and oblation. And upon the pinnacle [or battlement of the temple shall stand] the abomination of desolation, *even until the consummation [of the 2300 days.] But then the decreed [desolation] shall be poured [in turn] upon the Desolator.*"

He then adds, "This chronological prophecy [which I have attempted to render more closely and intelligibly, supplying the ellipsis necessary to complete the sense of the original,] *was evidently designed to explain the foregoing vision, especially in ITS CHRONOLOGICAL PART OF THE 2300 DAYS; at the end of which the predicted desolation of the Jews should cease, and their sanctuary be cleansed.*"—New Anal. Chro., Vol. 2, pp. 557, 559, 563.

The "Remarks" are more and more fruitful, in every thing which characterizes the work, as we advance. Two of the last three chapters are disposed of rather summarily. As there is nothing in them, either of *times or events*, which is directly calculated to *agitate*, by the prospect of "a speedy fulfilment," a table of contents is sufficient. And the author finds no difficulty in carrying his system through the twelfth and last chapter. The hand which could smite down the guards which heaven had placed around other parts of its truth, would, of course, show no mercy here.

We shall again place his dogmatical paraphrase of the portion to be considered, in contrast with the common reading of the text.

#### PROFESSOR CHASE.

"The twelfth chapter concludes the vision and the message. In view of the appalling trials which were to be endured, the promise of divine aid is given to the faithful; the hope of a glorious resurrection to the martyr. . . . 'At that time, thy people shall be delivered, every one that is found written in the book,'—all that survive; 'and, [as having been engaged worthily or unworthily in this great contest,] many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, [at the call of God, whenever that shall be,] some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars, forever and ever.'

"To the interrogation in the sixth verse of this twelfth chapter, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? it is replied in the seventh, 'a time, times, and a half,' that is, (probably, without intending to be

#### DANIEL THE PROPHET.

"AND AT THAT TIME SHALL MICHAEL STAND UP, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was SINCE THERE WAS A NATION, EVEN TO THAT SAME TIME: AND AT THAT TIME, thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even TO THE TIME OF THE END; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, HOW LONG SHALL IT BE TO THE END OF THESE WONDERS! And I

## PROFESSOR CHASE.

entirely definite,) three years and a half. Then these wonders of persecution might be expected to terminate with the persecutor's coming to his end."—Pp. 79, 80.

## DANIEL THE PROPHET.

heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, WHEN HE HELD UP HIS RIGHT HAND AND HIS LEFT HAND UNTO HEAVEN and SWARE BY HIM THAT LIVETH FOREVER, THAT IT SHALL BE FOR A TIME, TIMES, AND AN HALF, and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, ALL these things shall be finished."—xii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7.

What a mercy it is that these doctors and great men have been raised up to *correct* the word of God for us! Indeed, they appear to be much more ready to correct than to *believe* it. We poor simpletons have supposed *the Bible means what it says*, and that God here tells us *when the events spoken of should take place*. But it now appears not only that we are mistaken, but the angel of God did not know how to communicate what he intended. When he said, "*all these things shall be finished*" at a *stated time*, and that *with an oath*, he meant to say, that "the promise" and "the hope" that they should "ultimately" take place, should then be "given."—That certainly is an important *correction*. Again, when he says with an oath, that *all these wonders shall be finished* at a specified point of time, it means that these wonders may then "be *expected to terminate*;" and although the resurrection and glorification of the righteous are among the wonders, "*the end of the persecutor*" only is referred to.

And here the text should be corrected again. "The interrogation in the sixth verse of this twelfth chapter, *How long to the end of these wonders?*" instead of referring to the "*standing up of Michael*"—the "*time of trouble*," then to occur—the resurrection, and the glorification of the righteous, refers to "*the death of Antiochus*."—"How long," inquires the heavenly messenger, "*to the death of Antiochus?*" to which it is replied, "Without intending to be *entirely definite*—it is *three years and a half*—or to be *more definite*, it is *1290 days*."

But another difficulty occurs. This "interrogation" and its reply were uttered, according to our Professor, "in the third year of Cyrus, the 533d B. C." The period, taking the "*definite or indefinite statement*" of it, would extend to 586—7, B. C. Did the angel forget to specify his standpoint, or can the Professor show that "*the death of Antiochus*" took place *at this date*? How is it that he did not correct the text so as to make all "*plain and unambiguous*?"

He proceeds:—

"In the eleventh verse, we have a more definite statement of the period indicated in the seventh verse, by '*a time, times, and a half*:' 'From the

time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, shall be a thousand two hundred ninety days.'"—P. 80.

And why this catalogue of uncalled for assumptions—that the “three and a half years” are not “entirely definite,” that the 1290 days express a more definite statement of *the same period*, and that the event with which they terminate is *the persecutor's death*? Does the Professor suppose that the old and well established interpretation of the Book of Daniel is to give place to these bold assumptions, which at best only make the matter a hundred fold more ambiguous than it could possibly be, by admitting that view of the prophecy to which he objects!

Now, whatever this daily sacrifice and abomination of desolation may denote, nothing is more evident than that the same things are spoken of wherever they are mentioned in the prophecy. The portion in the 8th of Daniel, in which they are mentioned, contemplates the whole period during which they were to continue. In the 9th chapter, verse 27th, the appearance of *one* of them is predicted in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem. So Christ has applied this text, as Doctor Chase himself admits. The 31st verse of the 11th chapter predicts the removal of one, and the setting up of the other, with an allusion to the agents by whom it is done: “*and they shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.*” And this 11th verse of the 12th chapter, which Doctor Chase assumes to contain “a more definite statement of the period indicated in the seventh verse, by a time, times, and a half,” clearly expresses the period during which the abomination that maketh desolate should continue, as such, *after* the daily sacrifice should be taken away: *and from the time that the daily [sacrifice] shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, (Margin, to set up the abomination that astonisheth) there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.* But this, our Professor assumes, is “a definite statement” of the time of “*the death of Antiochus Epiphanes.*”

Does he believe that *Antiochus* was the abomination of desolation, or the *image* which was set up by his authority? It will not do to suppose that it denotes *Antiochus*, because that would be fatal to the Professor's application of the 1150 days. He lived a longer time than that, *after the Jewish worship was abolished*. Nor will it do to refer it to the image, and apply the text as its language evidently requires; that would be fatal to all the Professor's calculations. To allow the 1290 days to terminate with the removal of the image, or the restoration of the Jewish worship on “the 25th of Chisleu, in the 148th year of the Seleucidæ,” and “*reckon back,*” they must have commenced *before* the time that “*Apollonius, the officer sent by Antiochus,*” arrived at Jerusalem to *begin* the work of oppression, in June of the 145th year of the Seleucidæ, by his own showing.

He must, therefore, apply it in this arbitrary manner; and, with what history he has, (enough to show that it has nothing to do with the prophecy,) guess at its commencement, guess at its termination, and make up what is wanting with this very necessary, but very characteristic apology.

"There is no room to doubt, that were our histories a little more complete, were they as definite as the prophecy, the harmony between the prediction and fulfilment would be found to be *absolutely perfect*." So, with all the torturing of the prophecy to correspond with the history, we are obliged to submit the whole question to the decision of our impartial interpreter.

Another specimen of the "Remarks," and we must close.

#### PROFESSOR CHASE.

"But what is it that was to occur *forty-five* days later still? For this is the difference between a '*thousand two hundred and ninety*,' and a '*thousand three hundred and five-and-thirty*,' the number which marks the period next mentioned. Antiochus died in Persia, among the mountains of Paratacene, at a great distance from Palestine. . . .

"The arrival of that intelligence, forty-five days after the event, seems to be predicted in the twelfth verse, — '*Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five-and-thirty days*.'"—Pp. 81, 83.

#### DANIEL THE PROPHET.

"And I heard, but understood not: then said I, O my Lord, WHAT SHALL BE THE END OF THESE THINGS? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed TILL THE TIME OF THE END. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to THE THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED AND FIVE-AND-THIRTY DAYS. But go thou thy way TILL THE END BE, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot AT THE END OF THE DAYS."—xii. 8, 9, 12, 13.

After a few sentences, in which the author virtually repudiates his own effort, and, in spite of the spell which has been over him, speaks almost in the language of common Christians, he congratulates himself at the close with this remark, "*Our task is ended*."

And what a task! It was begun by fixing upon a scale of interpretation which is utterly subversive of the whole bearing and import of the word of God, and in plain contradiction of an inspired apostle. It was prosecuted under the fatal and fearful embarrassment of this awful perversion. It ends by misinterpreting the special promise of an eternal reward to Daniel, with a statement of the time when it should be realized, to make it speak of an event, the results of which, as a fulfilment of the prophecy, have left no trace upon the page of history, no memorial in the usages of a nation famous for such memorials, and which in itself could hardly serve to afford a momentary alleviation from their still protracted adversities.

It remains for us to make a few remarks upon this work of Professor Chase, without which our duty in reference to it would be imperfectly performed. 1. We should notice the work as the result of an acceptance of

this proposition, made by Mr. Miller, as is stated by the Professor in the preface to his remarks.

"There was much of candor and good sense in the reply which Mr. Miller once made to an individual who had asked what would convince him that his explanation was wrong: 'Give a better one. Cast down your rod; and if it become a serpent that swallows up mice and all the rest, very well. I will then give up. But it is of no use to reproach and ridicule me.'" Preface, p. vi.

Nothing certainly could be more proper than to give "Mr. Miller" a place among the accredited servants of God; and the fairness and frankness of the proposition are worthy only of his servants.

And it is scarcely less proper that the Professor should place himself on the side of the magicians, though they could have no great reason to be proud of such a successor. Not that his "rod" has been wanting in the voracity of the serpent; for surely, if its ability had been equal, it would have devoured, not only the rod of "Mr. Miller," but also that of "Moses and all the prophets," and, not content with that, it would have gone, like the dragon of the Revelator, into heaven, and left us without the hope of a Savior to "come again," or, that death should "be swallowed up in victory."

It may possess the gift of fascination sufficiently to captivate particular kinds of prey, but nothing could be feared from the power of its coil, the thrust of its fangs, or the darting of its sting. In short, we cannot conceive that any harm could be done by it, unless it were in cases where the fault was as much in the victim as in the agent.

But leaving this allegorical digression, in sober truth, a comparison of this work with most of the productions of Mr. Miller, as to every thing that can give real value to productions of the kind, is like a comparison of pure gold coin with fancy stock; the former has a permanent value, as to the affairs of this world we mean, because it can always be used, and there is no risk in having it on hand. The latter is good for nothing in itself, and will pass current only among those who know nothing about it, or those who may pretend to value it because they have an interest in its circulation.

The facts of history presented in Mr. Miller's interpretations of the prophecy, never appear any the less like facts from investigation; and his arguments, though they may not be framed by the strict rules of logic, have given more offence because of their strength than on account of their scholastic defects. Of the Professor's ingenuousness in exhibiting the facts of history, and of his logical acuteness, no man will have occasion to be proud.

The "moral reflections," which are occasionally found in his "remarks," appear to have been unconsciously inspired by his own case. The one which he expresses on referring to Josephus will serve as a

specimen,—“*we have melancholy evidence that even highly intelligent men are often under influences of which they are hardly aware!*”

We never fail of getting a train of thoughts, when Mr. Miller explains a portion of prophecy upon which the mind can dwell with interest and satisfaction. And there are thousands who will thank God for the light he has been instrumental of throwing on the book of Daniel in particular, as well as the whole field of truth surveyed by the Bible—thousands who may have but little faith in the minutiae of his chronological calculations. But the conviction forces itself unwillingly upon us, that Dr. Chase never wrote his “Remarks on the Book of Daniel,” with a view to explain and enforce its sublime and awful truths. However sincere he may have believed himself to be, we cannot but feel, that if he had given expression to the simple feelings of his heart, he would have said, as the heathen Emperor said to the devoted Judson, when the latter presented the message of eternal life to the consideration of the former—while surrounded by the obsequious retinue, and charmed by the rich music, and regaling himself with the luxuries of his court—“*I have no use for it.*”

In truth, Professor Chase had “no use” for the book of Daniel. And it was no part of his work to point out what it does mean, but to endeavor to make it mean *something else*. We could no more expect him to make a practical enforcement of its plain teachings, as to their bearing upon the prospects of the world at the present day, than we could expect a Jewish High Priest to prove the truth of Christianity by it. And we regard these perversions of the word of God by such men, as the most unequivocal, though awkward confessions that the Advent doctrine is there. However, if any one thinks that a place in perdition would be any more comfortable, by reflecting when he shall find himself there, that the way to heaven has been misinterpreted by such a hand, let him buy and believe the book.

It has been a matter of surprise to many that Dr. Chase could write such a work. Indeed, it is difficult to conceive how *any* man could do it. It would seem that the writer of the “Remarks” had become encouraged by the reception of Mr. Dowling’s “Reply to Miller,” and the “Hints” of Professor Stuart, with the public, and that he laid himself out in the contest, with a determination to win the highest prize; and no one, we think, will deny that he has the first claim.

He is as unfair as Mr. Dowling, but not so plain. The glaring misstatements of the “Reply,” operated in many cases as its own refutation, and disposed not a few of its most competent readers to think more favorably of the theory which it was designed to overthrow. The “Remarks” do not refer to that theory, directly, except in the preface, as above, and hence the virus has a chance to operate more fatally, inasmuch as the victim is not apprized of the fatal cheat which is being practised upon him, by having his attention called to the means of its detection.



Compared with the "Hints," this work of Dr. Chase takes very much the same track, so far as the same portions of prophecy are considered, but pushes on in a more daring manner, and gives the whole prophecy in question to the times of Antiochus.

There are as many "ifs" and *uncertainties* in the "Remarks," as in the "Hints" or the "Reply;" but the first work is far before the others in this particular. They do leave room for the Protestant Christian to think of his old hopes as *possibly* true, at least he may hang them on an *if*; but the "Remarks" do not leave us a fragment of the prophecy tangible enough to enter into the material of an ordinary Christian dream.

2. The reception of the "Remarks on the Book of Daniel," by the professedly religious community, so far as their periodicals are a fair indication of the fact, is still more remarkable than any thing else connected with the work. However, there are many reasons for doubting that the shouts of the press were responded to, by those of the community who take any interest in such questions. It is said to be a part of the management of the Parisian theatres to secure the services of individuals, who, having been previously made acquainted with the parts of the play which were to be thus distinguished, are required to applaud the performance with main strength, and if possible set the whole audience a going. But it has sometimes happened that the better sense of those not interested, kept in check everything like enthusiasm, so that "*the clique*" must not only perform their part alone, but would themselves become the mortified objects of attention for making so "much ado about nothing."

If our brother editors were not proof against every thing like mortification in such a case, we might hope they would escape a far more alarming result of the position they have taken in reference to the work of Dr. Chase. It is not their fault that the work has not been more extensively circulated.

We know not how far the shouts of the editorial *clique* have been heard, we refer only to those which have fallen unsought upon our own ears. But like most of the other opponents of "Millerism," the Professor has had the good fortune to secure nearly, if not quite, a unanimous cheering from all the sects, editorially, in his favor.

That the press of his own denomination, with some others, would speak in his favor, was to be expected, though we have no doubt that, under almost any other circumstances, the successors of Williams, and Gill, and Fuller, and Hall, and others who are now looking out from "the cloud of witnesses" upon them, would have impeached for *heresy* the author of the "Remarks" which they now applaud. But the *Orthodox* "Puritan," and "Recorder," certainly the last, has "puffed," even to loathing, the work before us.

None of them, however, to our knowledge, have come quite up to the *Methodist* "Advocate and Journal," of New York. Its editor appeared to be in extacies, after a perusal of the work. It must be a rare case

indeed, in which he wants for words to express himself, but in this case, to use his own language, he was "*staggered*." Great "Doctor Chase! Long established opinions must yield to Doctor Chase! This is none of your '*Millerisms*!' Buy Doctor Chase!" We don't know but he will introduce an amendment to the Breviary, to this effect:—

*"Dowling has slain his thousands,  
And Stuart his tens of thousands,  
But Great 'Doctor Chase' excels all the hosts of the Lord!"*

And its propriety could not be questioned, for no slaughter, by human or super-human agency in the ranks of Israel or their enemies, ever exceeded the slaughter which may be fairly ascribed to these modern heroes. Whether there would be any exaggeration of *numbers* or not, they can tell better than ourselves, as the "slain" are among their own ranks. And, seriously, it may be said that they have given a new and darker meaning to the saying of our Lord, "*It shall come to pass you that whosoever KILLETH you, shall think that he doeth God service.*"

3. What shall we say now to all this? Do these professedly Christian men, nay, ministers even, think the truth of God may be trifled with in this manner with impunity? Have they forgotten the fearful lessons, furnished by the personal, social, ecclesiastical, and political history of man, that *the God of the Bible is jealous of his truth?* or do they suppose that considerations of policy will justify the course they have taken? Why, instead of a justification, it would be rather a development of more aggravated guilt.—A confession that they occupy a position, the policy of sustaining which, requires them to violate every principle of duty to God, to outrage all the hallowed recollections of his servants, in the past, who have labored in the moral wilderness, to clear the ground, and set a hedge around the enclosure, and throw up the watch-towers, which are now so unworthily filled, and has prepared them to abandon their own avowed and cherished views of the prophecies.

Or, having predicted that "*the word of God would be brought into contempt by the promulgation of the views of Mr. Miller,*" are they determined at any rate, to become the instruments of fulfilling their own prediction? Or, finally, should we regard their course as a judicial infliction? "*I will choose THEIR DELUSIONS, saith the Lord.*" Since they have rejected the truth, in spite of everything which Heaven could give in proof that they are wrong, has it appointed, that, like the Jews of old, they should adopt a means of defence which should at the same time add the climax to their guilt and become suicidal?—"fill up the measure of their iniquity," and "bring the wrath of God upon them to the uttermost!"

We can hardly close without entreating them, though with deep emotions of sorrow—sorrow that their position requires us to speak as we do, and that there is so little hope that the only means of saving them will become effectual—to ask forgiveness of God, and to confess the injury they have inflicted upon the memory of those to whom they are indebted for every thing that man may value. Soon we shall be summoned into their presence, and no worldly policy, no disguise will avail in that hour! H.

# THE ADVENT SHIELD, AND REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1845.  
VOLUME I.—NUMBER 2.

## CONTENTS.

|                                                                         | PAGE. |                                                                | PAGE. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| ART. VI.—The Reformation of Luther—its Similarity to the Present Times. | 145   | ART. X.—Exclusiveness.                                         | 189   |
| ART. VII.—Satan's last Parochial Calls.                                 | 163   | ART. XI.—The Bereaved to the Departed.                         | 202   |
| ART. VIII.—Version of Dan, ii. vii. viii. ix.                           | 167   | ART. XII.—Reply to Prof. Bush's "Valley of Vision."            | 204   |
| ART. IX.—Prophetic Use of a day for a Year.                             | 181   | ART. XIII.—The Impossibility of the World's Conversion—Popery. | 223   |
|                                                                         |       | ART. XIV.—The Seventh Month Movement—our Position, &c.         | 267   |

EDITED BY  
J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS, & A. HALE.

Boston :  
PUBLISHED BY J. V. HIMES,  
No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.



THE  
ADVENT SHIELD.

### *The Reformation of Luther—its Similarity to the Present Times.*

We find that the great truths which were then about to be agitated, had slumbered in the church so long, that their existence was almost unknown ; while the errors which prevailed, and which it was necessary to expose and eradicate, had so long been the prevailing belief, that they had been supposed to have been the faith of the Church from the days of the apostles. God chose an obscure monk—**LUTHER**—a man of great natural ability, as the first instrument in the great work which was then commenced. “ An old wooden chapel, thirty feet long, and twenty broad,” was the cradle of the Reformation, in which it was first to any purpose preached ; and a contem-

porary remarked that it might "be aptly compared to the stable in which Christ was born." Among the thousand cathedrals and parish churches with which the world was filled, not one was chosen for the glorious announcement of everlasting life. Such a beginning forcibly reminds us of Mr. Miller and our own Chardon Street Chapel, which was but a stable at first.

"In a short time," says D'Aubigné, "the little chapel of Luther could no longer contain the crowds that flocked thither;" his doctrines astonished his auditors, his fame spread far and wide, and many flocked from distant places to hear. Luther obtained a profound knowledge of the word of God; he reasoned out of the Scriptures in a way that was new and astonishing to the people, and God raised him up friends. He then went forth supposing the church had only to hear the truth—to be shown the evidences of its authenticity, and she would receive it. His motto was,—“The writings of the apostles and prophets are more certain and sublime, than all the sophisms of the schools.” Multitudes listened to him with admiration, and marvelled that they had not earlier seen and acknowledged, truths, which he made so plain; and they compared his preaching to a new light arising after so long a night. Pious souls were attracted and penetrated by the sweetness of his doctrine. The firmness with which Luther appealed to the Scriptures gave power to his teachings, and his audiences acknowledged that he believed what he taught, and that his life corresponded with his precepts. The more men loved the Christian virtues, the more they inclined towards him. As Luther continued his labors, he saw more of the corruptions of the Church, and of the hopelessness of the expectation that she would embrace the truth. Those who wished to stand well with Rome and with society, spoke of him as a proud fellow and an ignorant monk, instead of meeting him with opposing arguments. For a time Luther's works were read in the theological schools with but little sensation; at a later period all gave ear to admire or oppose. He had no desire of becoming a reformer; he was distrustful of his own powers, and moved only as God seemed to open the door for him. He sought not to please men, but God; and so followed where his Master called. He had no settled purpose; his only wish was that the watchmen of the Church should arouse themselves, and endeavor to put a stop to the evils that were laying it waste. But the princes of the church

closed their ears to the voice of God, which was making itself heard in so affecting and energetic a manner by the voice of Luther. They would not understand the signs of the times; they were struck with that blindness which had been the ruin of so many. But, said Erasmus, "I observe that the more irreproachable men's morals, and the more evangelical their piety, the less are they opposed to Luther."

All Luther's efforts might have been spent on the air; but the partizans of Rome prevented their ending thus. They fanned the flame instead of extinguishing it. Eager to crush the audacious monk, they raised a shout of indignation; they disputed with and reviled him. On one occasion Tetzel opposed Luther with a series of propositions; but they were overthrown by John Knipstrow—a boy of twenty: and yet Tetzel is made a Doctor as a recompense, and contents himself with hurling his anathemas at Luther. The priests raised a shout against the poor monk, and "Luther's name resounded from all the Dominican pulpits." "They stirred up the passions of the people, called him a madman, a seducer, a wretch possessed of the devil;" and "his teaching was decried as the most horrible of heresies."

Luther saw the necessity of meeting his adversaries boldly; "but at the same time their weakness discovered to him his own strength, and inspired him with a consciousness of what it really was." Said he, "they are so ignorant both of human and divine things, that it is humbling to have to dispute with them; and yet it is this very ignorance which gives them their inconceivable boldness, and their brazen front." At Rome, for a time, they would not condescend to meddle with Luther's opinions; it is a "squabble among the monks," said Leo X., "the best way is not to notice it." But when a Roman censor sees fit to attack him, he employs "ridicule, revilings and threats."

Luther's fundamental proposition was—"the word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God." His opponents relied "only on the phrases and opinions of St. Thomas." They discovered more malice, than argument. John Eck, a Doctor of Divinity, speaks of Luther as "his feeble adversary," a "pestilent man," "a heretic," "seditious," "insolent," "rash," "dull," "stupid," and "ignorant;" but this only gave Luther fresh courage, who shows in reply that he is not convicted of heresy, either by the Scriptures, or the fathers of the Church; and only by mere opinions. The

more Luther was opposed, the more his opinions were read. To every objection the Doctors made, Luther always had a ready reply ; "but," said he, "it is useless to talk to a deaf man : these doctors cling to their petty distinctions, though they confess they have nothing to confirm them, but what they call the light of reason." When he appealed to the princes of the church, some laughed at him ; others turned a deaf ear ; but Luther ever expressed his wishes, that if they were able from the Scriptures, they would convict him of error. When arraigned before the Legate of the Pope, he said, "Deign to inform me wherein I have erred." To the Elector of Saxony he wrote, "Let them bring forward their reasons : let them instruct me who desire to be instructed ; let the Lord deprive me of his grace, if, when I am shown a better doctrine, I do not embrace it." But all who attempted the task, were obliged to retire in silence after a vigorous reply from the Reformer. Many replied to him to advance their own fame, but injured their cause by so doing. When they attempted, by contemptible decretals of Roman Pontiffs, not four centuries old, to prove the primacy of the Roman Church, he arrayed against this claim the credible history of the early Church, the express declarations of Scripture, and the conclusions of the council of Nice,—the most venerable of all councils.

While the pulpits were all open to the enemies of the Gospel, they were shut to those who proclaimed it ; and "it was currently reported of Luther in the meetings of the clergy, that he carried about with him the devil in a small box." Said Doctor Eck, "I am astonished at the humility and diffidence with which Luther undertakes to stand alone against so many illustrious Fathers ; thus affirming that he knows more of those things, than the Sovereign Pontiff, the councils, divines, and universities ; it would, no doubt, be very wonderful if God had hidden the truth from so many saints and martyrs, till the advent of him." Luther replied, "The Fathers are not opposed to me—St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and the most eminent divines say as I do ;" and he claimed that Eck "ran over Scripture without touching it." D'Aubigné says, that in Luther's controversy with Dr. Eck, the Doctor "obtained the victory in the opinion of those who do not understand the question, and who had grown grey in scholastic studies ; but Luther, in the judgment of those who have intelligence and modesty." They saw Luther relying on the word of God, while Eck took his stand on the tradi-



tions of men ; and though defeated, he “ gave himself up to the intoxication of what he tried to represent as a victory ; ” and “ the more he felt his weakness, the louder were his clamors.” At another time a princess inquired, “ Who is this Luther ? an ignorant monk ; well, you are learned and so many, write against him ; the world will surely believe a company of learned men, rather than a single monk of no learning.” But the learned found it easier to condemn and burn his writings, than to reply. The Pope attempts to silence him by a *bull* of excommunication ; Luther, in return, excommunicates the Pope. When overwhelmed with reproaches, and accused of standing alone, teaching new doctrines, he replied, “ Who knows whether God has not called me for this very purpose ? Moses was alone when the Israelites were led out of Egypt ; Elijah was alone in the time of king Ahab ; Ezekiel was alone at Babylon. God has never chosen for his prophet, either the high priest, or any person of exalted rank ; but generally men of mean condition—like Amos, a simple shepherd. The saints in every age have been called upon to rebuke the great of this world ; and they have more reason to fear, because I am alone and they are many. Of this I am sure, that the word of God is with me, and it is not with them. They affirm that I bring forth novelties ; but I affirm that they are not novelties, but truths which have been lost sight of. I am accused of rejecting the Doctors of the Church ; I reject them not, but test their writings by the Bible. It is objected that I am censured ; but the Scriptures show that they who persecute are in error ; and that the majority are always on the side of falsehood.”

Such was the manner in which the Reformation was ushered in. Who cannot see that it encountered the same elements which the reformation of our day has been called upon to encounter ?

Failing of intimidating Luther, the Church began to exert its influence over those who had embraced his doctrines. At the confessional, the questions were, Have you read Luther's writings ? and do you approve of his works ? And if they would not renounce them, they were anathematized. This expedient brought many under the yoke of the Church ; but it strengthened others in their faith. Luther bade his followers to adhere to the truth of God, if it was at the expense of the “ altar, the priest and the church.” And he proved from the

prophecies of Daniel, John, Paul, Peter, and Jude, that the Papacy is the Anti-christ predicted in the Bible ; and, said he, "may God hasten the day of the glorious coming of his Son, in which he shall destroy that man of sin." This caused the people to renounce their attachment to a church, which appeared, in every particular, so directly opposed to the example of its Founder. A man of humble station, holding the word of God in his hand, had stood in the presence of earthly dignities, and they had quailed before him. Learned divines and astonished theologians saw the weapons of their scholastic logic shivered in their hands. "Academicians, lawyers, nobles, the inferior clergy, many even of the monks, and vast numbers of the common people, embraced the Reformation."

The Papists, in answer to Luther's arguments from the Scriptures, replied : "The Bible—it is like wax ; you may stretch and mould it any way, and prove from it any doctrine you please." But they could not disprove from it Luther's doctrines. Their cry was, "He refuses to be set right ;" "these Lutherans are a motly rabble of insolent grammarians, disorderly monks, and ignorant, misled and perverted plebians." Again, when seeing Luther's advantage, they would say, "Only give up" such and such points which are unimportant, "and all will be well ;" "we agree in all essential points—the only question between us relates to some secondary points."

When Luther visited Worms, at the summons of the Emperor Charles V., crowds flocked to see him ; some of whom had conceived an idea of him as a prodigy of wisdom ; others as a monster of iniquity ; and yet on hearing him, all were struck with the joy of his countenance, and the wisdom of his discourses, which the Papists ascribed to the influence of the devil ; and any one, who manifested the least interest in his cause, was instantly cried down as a heretic. The enemies of the truth never failed to circulate inventions of pretended doctrines of Luther ; and nothing was too absurd and silly for them to ascribe to his belief : but all those things only recoiled on their own heads. The Reformation, which only sprung up in the hearts of a few monks, spread abroad, lifted itself on high, and assumed a station of publicity. Like the waters of the sea, it rose by degrees, until it overspread a wide expanse. The Bishop of Constance complained that evil-minded persons were reviving doctrines, which

had been condemned ; and that learned and unlearned men were alike every where irreverently discussing the most exalted mysteries. And the partisans of Rome, with that blind infatuation common to those who have long held power, were pleasing themselves with the thought, at every seeming advantage, that the Reformation was for ever at an end. Many of those weak persons, who, when things were nearly balanced, were found on the side of truth, whenever their own interest was concerned, were quite willing to take up again with error. When such left the cause, the priests were ready to exclaim, "we have silenced him who troubles Israel." The most celebrated schools and professors gave their verdict against the Reformation, and pronounced the doctrines of Luther heretical ; he, however, showed them that the heresy was in Rome and the schools, while the catholic truth was in Wittenberg.

When all the efforts of Rome, to crush the Reformation, had failed, and the frail bark, which had been tossed in every direction by so many winds, and been well nigh wrecked, had now apparently righted itself, it was called to encounter obstacles in another form. Says D'Aubigné :—

"Whenever a great ferment is working in the Church, some impure elements are sure to mingle with the testimony given to truth ; and some one or more pretended reforms arise out of man's imagination, and serve as evidences or countersigns of some *real* reformation in progress. Thus many false Messiahs in the first century of the Church, were an evidence that the true Messiah had already come. The Reformation of the sixteenth century could not run its course without presenting the like phenomenon, and it was first exhibited in the little village of Zwickau.

There were dwelling at Zwickau a few men, who, being deeply moved by the events passing around them, looked for *special* and *direct* revelations from the Deity, instead of desiring, in meekness and simplicity, the sanctification of their affections. These persons asserted that they were commissioned to complete that Reformation which in their view Luther had but feebly begun. 'What is the use,' asked they, 'of such close application to the Bible ? Nothing is heard of but the BIBLE. Can the Bible preach to us ? Can it suffice for our instruction ? If God had intended to instruct us by a book, would he not have given us a Bible direct from heaven ! It is only the SPIRIT that can enlighten ! God himself speaks to us, and shows us what to do and say.' Thus did these fanatics, playing into the hands

of Rome, impugn the fundamental principle on which the whole Reformation is based; namely, the perfect sufficiency of the Word of God.

Nicolas Storch, a weaver, publicly declared that the angel Gabriel had appeared to him by night, and after revealing to him matters he was not allowed to divulge, had uttered the words—'Thou shalt sit on my throne!' A senior student of Wittemberg, named Mark Stubner, joined Storch, and forthwith abandoned his studies,—for, according to his own statement, he had received immediately from God the ability to interpret holy Scripture. Mark Thomas, also a weaver, associated himself with them; and another of the initiated, by name Thomas Munzer, a man of fanatical turn of mind, gave to the new sect a regular organization. Resolving to act according to the example of Christ, Storch chose from among his followers twelve apostles and seventy disciples. All these loudly proclaimed, as we have lately heard it asserted by a sect of our own days,\* that apostles and prophets were at last restored to the Church.

Such preaching made a deep impression on the popular mind. Not a few devout persons were startled by the thought that prophets were again given to the Church, and those on whom the love of the marvellous had most power, threw themselves into the open arms of the eccentric preachers of Zwickau.

But scarcely had this heresy, which had shown itself of old in the days of Montanism, and again in the middle ages, drawn together a handful of separatists, when it encountered in the Reformation a strong opposing power. Nicholas Haussman, to whom Luther gave that noble testimony—'*What we teach, he acts,*' was at this time the pastor of Zwickau. This good man was not led away by the pretensions of the false prophets. Supported by his two deacons, he successfully resisted the innovations Storch and his followers were seeking to introduce. The fanatics, repelled by the pastors of the church, fell into another extravagance; they formed meetings, in which doctrines subversive of order were publicly preached. The people caught the infection, and disturbances were the consequence; the priest bearing the sacrament, was pelted with stones, and the civil authority interfering, committed the most violent of the party to prison. Indignant at this treatment, and intent upon justifying themselves and obtaining redress, Storch, Mark Thomas, and Stubner, repaired to Wittemberg.

Making sure of co-operation, they waited upon the University Professors, to receive their sanction. 'We,' said they, 'are sent by God to teach the people. The Lord has favored us with special communications from Himself; we have the knowledge of things which are coming upon the earth. In a word, we are apostles and prophets, and we appeal, for the truth of what we say, to Doctor Luther.' The Professors were amazed.

\* The Mormons.

'Who commissioned you to preach?' inquired Melancthon of Stubner, who had formerly studied under him, and whom he now received at his table.—'The Lord our God.'—'Have you committed any thing to writing?'—'The Lord our God has forbidden me to do so.' Melancthon drew back, alarmed and astonished.

'There are indeed spirits of no ordinary kind in these men,' said he; 'but *what* spirits? . . . none but Luther can solve the doubt. On the one hand let us beware of quenching the Spirit of God; and on the other, of being seduced by the spirit of the devil.'

It was not long before one who listened to these enthusiasts might have thought that there were no real Christians in all Wittemberg, save only those who refused to come to confession, persecuted the priests, and ate meat on fast days. The bare suspicion that he did not reject, one and all, the ceremonies of the Church as inventions of the devil, was enough to subject a man to the charge of being a worshipper of Baal. 'We must form a church,' they exclaimed, 'that shall consist of the saints alone!'

Thus it was that doctrines were put forth directly opposed to the Reformation. The revival of letters had opened a way for the reformed opinions. Furnished with theological learning, Luther had joined issue with Rome;—and the Wittemberg enthusiasts, similar to those fanatical monks exposed by Erasmus and Reuchlin, pretended to trample under foot all human learning! Only let Vandalism once establish its sway, and the hopes of the world were gone; and another irruption of barbarians would quench the light which God had kindled among Christian people.

It was not long before the results of these strange lessons began to show themselves. Men's minds were diverted from the Gospel, or prejudiced against it: the school was almost broken up; the demoralized students burst the bands of discipline, and the states of Germany recalled such as belonged to their several jurisdictions. Thus the men who aimed at reforming, and infusing new vigor into every thing, had brought all to the brink of ruin. 'One more effort,' thought the partisans of Rome, who, on all sides, were again lifting their heads, 'and all will be ours!'

The prompt repression of these fanatical excesses was the only means of saving the Reformation.

The evil, therefore, was gaining ground, and no one stepped forward to arrest its progress. Luther was absent far from Wittemberg. Confusion and ruin impended over the city. The Reformation beheld, proceeding, as it were from its own bosom, an enemy more to be dreaded than Popes and Emperors. It was as if on the brink of an abyss.

'Luther! Luther!' was the cry from one end of Wittemberg to the other. The burghers were clamorous for his re-appearance. Divines felt their need of the benefit of his judgment; even the prophets appealed to him. All united in entreating him to return.

We may guess what was passing in the Reformer's mind. The harsh usage of Rome seemed nothing when compared with what now wrung his heart. It is from the very midst of the Reformation that its enemies have gone forth. It is preying upon its own vitals; and that teaching, which, by its power, had sufficed to restore peace to his troubled heart, he beholds perverted into an occasion of fatal dissensions in the Church.

'If I knew,' said Luther, at an earlier period, 'that my doctrine had injured one human being, however poor and unknown,—which it could not, for it is the very Gospel,—I would rather face death ten times over, than not retract it. And lo! now, a whole city, and that city Wittemberg itself, is sinking fast into licentiousness.' True, indeed, the doctrine he had taught had not been the cause of all this evil; but from every quarter of Germany voices were heard that accused him as the author of it. Some of the bitterest feelings he had ever known oppressed his spirits at this juncture, and his trial was of a different kind. Was this, then, he asked himself, to be the issue of the great work of Reformation? Impossible! he utterly rejected the doubts that presented themselves. God has begun the work—God will fulfil it. 'I prostrate myself in deep abasement before the Eternal,' said he, 'and I implore of Him that His name may rest upon this work, and that if anything impure has mingled in the doing of it, He will remember that I am but a sinful man.'

Luther was aware that the ancient and primitive Apostolic Church must, on the one hand, be restored and opposed to that Papal power which had so long oppressed it,—and on the other hand, be defended against enthusiasts and unbelievers, who affected to disown it, and were seeking to set up some new thing, regardless of all that God had done in past ages.

He set about his work in the spirit of an humble pastor—a tender shepherd of souls. 'It is with *the Word* we must contend,' observed he, 'and by *the Word* we must refute and expel what has gained a footing by violence. I would not resort to force against such as are superstitious;—nor even against unbelievers! Whosoever believeth let him draw nigh, and whoso believeth not, stand afar off. Let there be no compulsion. Liberty is of the very essence of Faith.'

The most noted of the prophets were not at Wittemberg when Luther arrived there. Nicolas Storch was on a progress through the country. Mark Stubner had quitted the hospitable roof of Melancthon.

Stubner exhorted them to stand firm. 'Let him come forth,' interposed Cellarius; 'let him give us the meeting; let him only afford us opportunity to declare our doctrine, and then we shall see . . . .'

Luther had but little wish to meet them. He knew them to be men of violent, hasty, and haughty temper, who would not endure even kind admonitions, but required that every one should, at the very first summons, submit to them as to a supreme authority. Such are enthusiasts in every age. Nevertheless, as an interview was requested, Luther could not decline it.—Besides it might be doing service to the weak of the flock to unmask the imposture of the prophets. Accordingly the meeting took place. Stubner opened the conversation. He showed how he proposed to restore the Church and reform the world. Luther listened to him with great calmness. 'Of all you have been saying,' replied he, at last, gravely, 'there is nothing that I see to be based upon Scripture. It is a mere tissue of fiction. At these words Cellarius lost all self-possession. Raising his voice like one out of his mind, he trembled from head to foot, and striking the table with his fist, in a violent passion, exclaimed against Luther's speech as an insult offered to a man of God.' On this Luther remarked, 'Paul declared that the signs of an apostle were wrought among the Corinthians, in signs and mighty deeds. Do you likewise prove your apostleship by miracles?'—'We will do so,' rejoined the prophets. 'The God whom I serve,' answered Luther, 'will know how to bridle your gods.' Stubner, who had hitherto preserved an imperturbable silence, now fixing his eyes on the Reformer, said, in a solemn tone, 'Martin Luther, hear me while I declare what is passing at this moment in your soul. You are beginning to see that my doctrine is true.' Luther was silent for a few moments, and then replied, 'The Lord rebuke thee, Satan.' Instantly the prophets lost all self-command. They shouted aloud, 'The Spirit, the Spirit.' The answer of Luther was marked by the cool contempt and cutting homeliness of his expressions: 'I slap your spirit on the snout!' said he. Hereupon their outcries redoubled. Cellarius was more violent than the rest. He stormed till he foamed at the mouth,—and their voices were inaudible from the tumult. The result was, that the pretended prophets abandoned the field, and that very day they left Wittenberg.

'The Sacred Writings,' said Luther, were treated by them as a dead letter, and their cry was, 'the Spirit! the Spirit!' But assuredly, I, for one, will not follow whither their spirit is leading them! May God, in His mercy, preserve me from a Church in which there are only such saints. I wish to be in fellowship with the humble, the weak, the sick, who know and feel their sin, and sigh and cry continually to God from the

bottom of their hearts to obtain comfort and deliverance.' These words of Luther have a depth of meaning, and indicate the change which his views were undergoing as to the nature of the Church. They, at the same time, show how opposed the religious principles of the rebels were to the religious principles of the Reformation.

The most noted of these enthusiasts was Thomas Munzer; he was not without talent; had read his Bible, was of a zealous temperament, and might have done good, if he had been able to gather up his agitated thoughts, and attain to settled peace of conscience. But with little knowledge of his own heart, and wanting in true humility, he was taken up with the desire of reforming the world, and, like the generality of enthusiasts, forgot that it was with himself he should begin. Certain mystical writings, which he had read in his youth, had given a false direction to his thoughts. He made his first appearance in public at Zwickau;—quitted Wittemberg on Luther's return thither,—not satisfied to hold a secondary place in the general esteem, and became pastor of the small town of Alstadt, in Thuringia. Here he could not long remain quiet, but publicly charged the Reformers with establishing by their adherence to the written Word a species of Popery, and with forming churches which were not pure and holy.

'Luther,' said he, 'has liberated men's consciences from the Papal yoke; but he has left them in a carnal liberty, and has not led them forward in spirit towards God.'

He considered himself as called of God to remedy this great evil. The Revelations of the *Spirit*, according to him, were the means by which the Reformation he was charged with should be effected. 'He who hath the Spirit,' said he, 'hath true faith, although he should never once in all his life, see the Holy Scriptures. The heathen and the Turks are better prepared to receive the Spirit than many of those Christians who call us enthusiasts.' This remark was directed against Luther. 'In order to receive the Spirit,' continued he, 'we must mortify the flesh—wear sackcloth—neglect the body—be of a sad countenance—keep silent—forsake the haunts of men—and implore God to vouchsafe to us an assurance of His favor. Then it is that God will come to us, and talk with us, as he did of old with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. If He were not to do so, he would not deserve our regard. I have received from God the commission to gather together His elect in a holy and eternal union.'

The agitation and ferment which were working in men's minds were not a little favorable to the spread of these enthusiastic ideas. Men love the marvellous and whatever flatters their pride. Munzer having inoculated with his own views a portion of his flock, abolished the practice of chaunting, and all the other ceremonies annexed to public worship. He maintained that to



obey princes 'devoid of understanding,' was to serve, at one and the same time, God and Belial; and then setting off at the head of his parishioners to a chapel in the neighborhood of Alstadt, to which pilgrims were accustomed to resort from all quarters, he totally demolished it. After this exploit, being obliged to leave the country, he wandered from place to place in Germany, and came as far as Switzerland, everywhere carrying with him, and communicating to all who gave ear to him, the project of a general revolution. Wherever he went he found men's minds prepared. His words were like gunpowder cast upon burning coals, and a violent explosion quickly ensued.

That moral agony which Luther had first undergone in his cell at Erfurth, was perhaps at its height after the revolt of the peasants. On the side of the princes it was repeated, and in many quarters believed, that Luther's teaching had been the cause of the rebellion; and groundless as was the charge, the Reformer could not but feel deeply affected by the credit attached to it. On the side of the people, Munzer and all the leaders of the sedition represented him as a vile hypocrite and flatterer of the great, and their calumnies easily obtained belief. The strength with which Luther had declared against the rebels, had given offence even to men of moderate opinions. The partisans of Rome exulted, all seemed against him, and he bore the indignation of that generation: but what most grieved him was that the work of heaven should be thus degraded by being classed with the dreams of fanatics.

This fanaticism broke forth in lamentable disorders. Alleging, in excuse, that the Savior had exhorted us to become as little children, these poor creatures began to go dancing through the streets, clapping their hands, footing it in a circle, seating themselves on the ground together, and tumbling each other in the sand. Some there were who threw the New Testament into the fire, exclaiming, 'The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life;' and several, falling into convulsions, pretended to have revelations from the Holy Spirit."

The fanatics, unrestrained, ran into the greatest excesses; revolt was encouraged, blood was shed, and towns were pillaged; and the mercy of God alone preserved His cause. But the firmness with which Luther, and those whom God had made foremost in the work, met and protested against those delusions, showed to the world that the Reformation was entirely distinct from the fanaticism of those spirits. Its character was distinctly seen; and it was demonstrated that its mission was to keep constantly a middle course between all extremes—remote alike from fanatical distortion and political disorders, on the one hand; and from the death-like

slumber of the papal rule on the other. The battle which the Reformation fought was not one, but manifold. It had to combat at once several enemies; and after having protested against the decretals, and the sovereignty of the Popes—then against the cold apothegms of rationalists, philosophers, and schoolmen,—it took the field against the reveries of enthusiasm, and the hallucinations of mysticism; opposing alike to these three powers, the sword and the buckler of God's Holy Revelation. Says D'Aubigné,—

“We cannot but discern a great resemblance,—a striking unity,—between these three powerful adversaries. The false systems which, in every age, have been the most adverse to evangelical Christianity, have ever been distinguished by their making religious knowledge to emanate from man himself. Rationalism makes it proceed from reason; Mysticism from a certain internal illumination; Roman Catholicism from an illumination derived from the Pope. These three errors look for truth in man; Evangelical Christianity looks for it in God alone: and while Rationalism, Mysticism, and Roman Catholicism acknowledge a permanent inspiration in men like ourselves, and thus make room for every species of extravagance and schism,—Evangelical Christianity recognises this inspiration only in the writings of the Apostles and Prophets; and alone presents that great, noble, and living unity which continues to exist unchanged throughout all ages.

The office of the Reformation has been to re-establish the rights of the word of God, in opposition, not only to Roman Catholicism, but also to Rationalism and Mysticism.”

Luther perseveres in his soul-charming enterprise. He translates the entire Scriptures, and gives them to the people in their own language. This was joyfully welcomed by such as loved the Lord Jesus Christ; but it was scornfully rejected by such as preferred the traditions and ordinances of men. The ignorant priests were dismayed at the thought, that burghers, and even rustics, would now be able freely to discuss with them the precepts of the Lord. And Rome, in the 16th century, used the same means to destroy the religion of Jesus, that heathenism did in the first; but without effect.

The more Rome prohibited the reading of the Scriptures, so much the more people were anxious to read them. All who knew how to read, studied the New Testament with eager delight. They carried it about with them and committed large portions of it to memory.

Henry VIII., the royal king of England, indignant that an humble monk should set the learned world at defiance, laid aside his royal dignity, and descended from his throne into the arena of theological dispute ; expecting, at one full blow, to annihilate the Reformation from the earth. He could not conceal the contempt which he felt for his “ feeble adversary ; ” and was not sparing of hard epithets, calling him “ an infernal wolf,” a “ poisonous serpent,” and “ a limb of the devil.”

When his work appeared, the Catholic party set no bounds to its praises, and it was by them received with “ profound adulation ; ” they styled it “ the most learned work the sun ever saw.” He was compared to a St. Augustine, a Constantine, a Charlemagne, and a “ Second Solomon ; ” and the whole Roman world exulted with joy.

Luther read Henry’s work with a smile, mingled with disdain. The falsehoods, and insults, and personalities it contained, the air of contempt the king affected, and the thought that the Pope and enemies on all sides regarded it as having demolished the Reformation, filled him with indignation. He showed how Henry only supported his statements by “ decrees and doctrines of men.” “ As for me,” says he, “ I do not cease my cry of the Gospel ! the Gospel !—Christ ! Christ !—and my enemies are as ready with their answer—Custom ! Custom !—Ordinances ! Ordinances !—Fathers ! Fathers !—‘ That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,’ says St. Paul. And the Apostle, by this thunder clap from heaven, at once overturns and disperses, as the wind scatters the dust, all the foolish thoughts of such a one as Henry ! Alarmed and confounded, the Aquinases, Papists, Henrys, fall prostrate before the power of these words. “ To all the decisions of Fathers, of men, of angels, of devils, I oppose,” says he, “ not the antiquity of custom, not the habits of the many, but the word of the Eternal God—the Gospel—which they themselves are obliged to admit. It is to this book that I keep—upon it I rest—in it I make my boast—in it I triumph and exult. The King of heaven is on my side ; therefore I fear nothing.” And thus, with argument drawn from the word, did Luther demolish and scatter to the winds all the sophisms of his opposers. And though all seemed to combine against him, yet this new sect, few in number, with no organization, or acting in concert, or concentration of power, carried consternation to the heart of Rome.

Luther's writings were read in the boroughs, cities and hamlets; even the village school-master had his fire-side audiences. Some persons in every place would be impressed with the truth and receive the word, and men were raised up to proclaim it far and wide, at whose eloquence the people were astonished. Such preaching excited terrible opposition; and the clergy, aided by the magistrates, used every means to win back their hearers, whose souls were escaping from bondage. But there was an irresistible energy, and accordance with the Scriptures, in the new preaching, which won the heart; and sometimes the people, irritated at the thought how long they had been duped, drove away their priests. Persecution often scattered the favorers of the Reformation to new places, where it had never before been heard. There they would find some hospitable roof where they would preach to the listening townsmen, and sometimes from the pulpit of a church. If not permitted to enter there, any place became a temple; and their words would spread like fire through the town, and no effort could stay their progress. Simple Christians with the Bible in their hand, were ever ready to defend their doctrines. Says D'Aubigné,

"Individuals were often seen with the New Testament in hand, offering to justify the doctrine of the Reformation. The Catholics, who adhered to Rome, drew back in dismay; for the study of Holy Scripture was reserved to the priests and monks alone. The latter being thus compelled to come forward, discussion ensued; but the priests and monks were soon overwhelmed with the Scriptures quoted by the laity, and at a loss how to meet them. 'Unhappily,' says Cochläus, 'Luther had persuaded his followers that their faith ought only to be given to the oracles of Holy Writ.' Often clamours were heard in the crowd, denouncing the shameful ignorance of the old theologians, who had till then been regarded by their own party as among the most eminently learned.

"Men of the humblest capacity, and even the weaker sex, by the help of the knowledge of the Word, persuaded, and prevailed with many. Extraordinary times produced extraordinary actions. At Ingolstadt a young weaver read the works of Luther to a crowded congregation, in the very place where Doctor Eck was residing. The university council of the same town, having resolved to oblige a disciple of Melancthon to retract,—a woman, named Argula de Staufen, volunteered to defend him, and challenged the doctors to a public disputation. Women, children, artizans, and soldiers, had acquired a greater knowledge of the Bible than learned doctors or surpliced priests."

Thus on public occasions, in their encounters with the Roman Doctors, they would carry on the assault with an ease and confidence that embarrassed the dullness of their adversaries, and exposed them before all to deserved contempt. The clergy, in the irritation of their defeat, went the length of calling the Gospel truth, "an invention of hell." And the different parties of Romanists, the Dominicans, Augustines, Capuchins, so long opposed to each other, were reduced to the necessity of living together—an anticipated *purgatory* for those poor monks.

The whole of the authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, combined to crush the Reformation, which they called "a new and strange heresy," which was taught "by those who were neither priests or monks, and had no business to preach." The torch and the fagot were lighted; and men were called to testify to their faith by their blood, and seal it with their lives. And yet it spread; and men went every where preaching the word. Throughout Germany, particularly in the Saxon states, in France, and Holland, in Switzerland, and England, and still in other lands, the Lord caused the truth to take deep root, and to spring up and bear much fruit. All the persecutions of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities only served to extend it farther; and all the fanaticism which the devil endeavored to infuse into its ranks, served but to envelop it in darkness. It was the cause of God; and he preserved it from dangers which assailed it alike on either hand; so that it became like a goodly tree, with stately trunk its roots extended deep, and its boughs far and wide, and clothed with perennial verdure; withstanding all the assaults of Rome for near three hundred years.

But, alas! How obscured have become the principles for which Luther so strenuously and triumphantly contended! In these last days the reformed church has sunk into the same lethargy and stupor, from which Luther, with the thunders of the Gospel, aroused it. The odious practices of Rome, and her disgusting mummeries, it is true, have not been again embraced. But there are again the same respect for the opinions of men, the same fear of the human church, the same reliance upon creeds and formulas, the same worldly-mindedness, and love of the things which now exist, the same deadness, and coldness, and lukewarmness, and putting far off the day of the Lord, and the same substitution of human commentaries for the unadulterated word of God; so that

when the angel, flying through the midst of heaven, began to preach the everlasting Gospel to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come ; she was unwilling to heed the cry. And when the servants were sent forth at supper time, to say to them that were bidden, " Come, for all things are now ready," the great body of them began with one consent to make excuse ; and they turned away, one to his farm, another to his merchandise, and another to his marriage feast, saying, I pray thee have me excused, I cannot come ; and so they refused to go out to meet the Bridegroom.

But He who never slumbers or sleeps has set in progress another reformation, the anti-type of that of the days of Luther. He has raised up men of the same energetic, self-denying spirit, who have gone into the field wielding the same weapons, with the same results that were then witnessed. In the days of Luther one of the German princes dreamed that he saw a monk writing with a mighty pen, the feather end of which reached to Rome and caused the lions there to growl and roar ; and that from out of this pen proceeded thousands of others, all of which were busily employed in writing against the Pope. So has the same pen, with all its auxiliary helps, been called into exercise now ; and it has caused the lions of the church to snarl and growl with all the venom that was manifested then. The reformation now encounters the same obstacles which it encountered then ; it meets the same contumely and reproach ; the same contempt is manifested towards it ; the same arguments and sophisms are arrayed against it ; it encounters alike the hatred of the church and world ; and every legal measure is resorted to, to crush it. It also has the same internal enemies, endeavoring to eat out its very vitals, and to wreck the ship of Zion on the rocks and quicksands of fanaticism, by leading those who favor it into unseemly excesses, and the extravagancies of mysticism. The battle which it is called to fight is as manifold as was that of Luther. Like that, it is called to contend against the cold apothegms of rationalists, philosophers, and schoolmen, and against the reveries of enthusiastical hallucinations. It is showing to the world that its mission is to keep constantly a middle course, between all extremes ; remote alike from fanatical distortions, and the death-like slumber of the church. It also is crowned with the same success in its encounters

with the Doctors of the day, whose efforts to crush it have only displayed their own weakness. The most humble individuals, with the word of God in their hands, have distanced those who, pleading the customs of men, have retired abashed.

This cause, like that, is also the cause of God. It is His Almighty power which has thus far sustained it. He will continue to preserve it from foes without, and foes within, until it has accomplished all that God designs of it. But we may learn from the history of the reformation of Luther, how every good cause will be assailed in manifold and divers manners; and thus be enabled to shun the pit-falls which beset our path, and the snares which are laid on every side. To accomplish this, we need much wisdom from on high; but if we take the word of God alone, and look to Him for guidance, He will sustain our feeble steps and refresh our waiting spirits, until the last loud trump shall shortly break upon the listening ear, and all the sleeping saints, arising from their dusty beds, shall with the righteous living join in one glad chorus, to sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. B.

---

#### ARTICLE VII.

##### *Satan's last Parochial Calls.*

###### I.

Dark frowns are on his brow—  
And shuddering in his heart;  
He fears his kingdom now  
Will speedily depart:—  
Portentous signs marked in the sky,  
Have warned the Tempter's doom is nigh.

###### II.

The darkening sun at noon,  
Brought fear and trembling dread—  
The falling stars and bloody moon  
Pale consternation fed:—  
Yet th' quaking doomed-one, with his host,  
Strives to arouse with empty boast.

## III.

And so hell's deeps resound  
With the "grizzly terror's" voice ;  
And the legions to be bound  
Fiendish and grim rejoice !  
But their sinning hearts are seared and dry,  
For they know their torment time is nigh !

## IV.

"Up, Beelzebub ! Lucifer ! Chieftains of hell !  
Ye princes of strength, to the 'field !'  
For six thousand years we have ruled the 'world' well,  
And now shall we passively yield ?

## V.

"Has the 'time' of our 'torment' arrived so soon ?  
Has the earth already waxed old ?  
No ! no ! in Time's day 'tis only just noon,  
As we earthly subjects have told !

## VI.

"For ages to come, in our millennium,  
We'll till our parsonage farm !  
(Aside—Yet, I tremblingly fear, this is the last year—  
In secret I am in alarm !)

## VII.

"And in great wrath I'll down on the earth,  
And work all my engines with fury ;  
For, surely, long yet on my throne shall I sit,  
Undoomed by the Judgment's Grand Jury."

## VIII.

Thus in his destroying, as eager as ever,  
He seeks his ancient domain—  
Proclaims to his subjects—submit he will never !  
But o'er earthly kingdoms will reign !

## IX.

Lo, the chief in high places his mission he takes—  
Breathes a thought that works like a spell  
Of sweet peace and safety, an opiate, makes  
Men quaff it—on earth proudly dwell !

## X.

"How fair is the world—its colors how bright !  
Our tabernacle here let us build !  
For Time's golden age is dawning in light—  
Soon with glory the earth will be filled !



## XI.

"Mechanics, machinery, and every art,  
Their maximum soon will attain ;  
The thought that these things are soon to depart,  
Is foolish, nonsensical, vain !

## XII.

"How flames the red torch of each chariot car !  
As it rages in thundering tone,—  
See ! 'they run like the lightning,' and speed them afar,  
Raging,—and gleaming,—and gone !

## XIII.

"Yes, Earth, thou hast goods for many a year  
Laid up in rich bountiful store !  
'Eat, drink, and be merry,' have never a fear,  
The Judge is not yet at the door !

## XIV.

"For many are running 'up and down'—to and fro,  
And the knowledge doth greatly increase :  
That the Lord is at hand, we choose not to 'know ;'  
Long yet may our churches have peace !"

## XV.

So speak the deluded, by tempter inspired  
To prophecy out of the heart ;  
To conquer the world all Christendom's fired :  
*By the world she is conquered in part !*

## XVI.

Thus "the god of this world," he covers the truth  
With his lies and specious devices ;  
And each liege subject deems blindly, forsooth,  
'Tis another his master entices.

## XVII.

He well can deceive, and makes them believe  
That the judgment is not surely nigh ;  
He tempts men to wrest the precious truth blest,  
And swift to destruction they fly !

## XVIII.

His snare it is laid with the fowler's tried skill,  
And catches "both people and priest,"  
Save those who would do only Jesus' blest will,  
Of the flock, the simplest and blest.

## XIX.

The Savior's right hand is extended to save  
These "little ones," humble and meek ;  
And when to his care they tremblingly yield,  
Thus to them he kindly doth speak : —

## XX.

"Fear not, little flock, my Father's good will  
Is to give you the kingdom prepared ;  
In patience keep watching—all righteousness fill—  
The kingdom shall shortly be shared."

## XXI.

But the "spirits of devils," that miracles make,  
Adown on the earth gather now ;  
And the kingdoms from slumber affrighted awake,  
For battle-clouds threaten upon the night's brow !

## XXII.

Each minion of hell is abroad at his post,  
For Satan in wrath has come down ;  
Already they're making their Belshazzar boast  
That the Lord on his people doth frown.

## XXIII.

For contest they gather, with hearts hissing strife,  
All they who love not the Lord ;  
But the tried and the faithful are watching for "life,"  
And trustingly lean on his word.

## XXIV.

The tempter goes on his parochial way,  
And gives to each hearer his portion ;  
He tells them, afar, very far, is God's day,  
So they worship the world with devotion.

## XXV.

Thus down on the earth he came in great wrath,  
To work all his engines with fury ;  
He hoped that long yet on his throne he should set,  
Undoomed by the Judgment's Grand Jury.

## XXVI.

Yet the Judge from on high now stands at the door,  
And Satan will shortly be bound ;  
His boasted long reign on the earth will be o'er,  
When the trump of the Judgment shall sound !

## XXVII.

Behold it is past ! *the second woe's past !*  
 And the third woe *quickly* will come !  
 The hosts of the wicked are numbering fast,  
 And hastening now is their doom !

E. C. C.

## ARTICLE VIII.

*Version of Daniel ii. vii. viii. ix.*

THE following article claims to be nothing more than the result of a careful collation of the common English translation with the original. That original is Hebrew, from the commencement to the words found in the fourth verse, "O king"—(*Malcá*.) The remainder is Chaldaic—(*Arámith*) or the eastern Syriac, to the end of the seventh chapter. The Hebrew is then used by the prophet, until the book is finished.

N. N. W.

- 1 AND in the second year of the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, and his spirit was agitated, and his sleep was ended for him.
- 2 And the king commanded to call the sacred scribes, and the magicians, and the sorcerers, and the astrologers, to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king.
- 3 And the king said to them, dreaming I have dreamed, and my spirit was agitated to know the dream.
- 4 Then spoke the astrologers to the king in Syriac, O king, live for ever : tell thy servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation.
- 5 The king answered and said to the astrologers, the thing hath gone from me : if ye shall not make known to me the dream and its interpretation, ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill.
- 6 But if ye show the dream, and its interpretation, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honor : therefore show me the dream, and its interpretation.

- 7 They answered again and said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will show its interpretation.
- 8 The king answered and said, Truly I know that ye would gain the time, because ye see the thing hath gone
- 9 from me. But, if ye will not make known to me the dream, *there is but* one decree for you : for ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me, till the time be changed : therefore tell me the dream, and I shall know that ye can show me its interpretation.
- 10 The astrologers answered before the king, and said, There is not a man on the earth that can show the king's matter : therefore *there is* no king, lord, or ruler, *that* asked such a thing of any sacred scribe, or magician, or
- 11 astrologer. And *it is* a difficult thing that the king asketh, and there is no other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh.
- 12 For this cause the king was angry and very furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise *men* of Babylon.
- 13 And the decree went forth that the wise *men* should be slain ; and they sought Daniel and his companions to be slain.
- 14 Then Daniel answered with prudence and wisdom to Arioch, the captain of the king's guard, who had gone
- 15 forth to slay the wise *men* of Babylon : He answered and said to Arioch, the king's captain, Why *is* the decree *so* hasty from the king ? Then Arioch made the
- 16 thing known to Daniel. And Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him time, and that he would show the king the interpretation.
- 17 Then Daniel departed to his house and made the thing known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his compan-
- 18 ions : that they would entreat mercies from the God of the heavens concerning this secret ; that Daniel and his companions should not perish with the rest of the wise *men* of Babylon.
- 19 Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision. Then Daniel blessed the God of the heavens.
- 20 Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God
- 21 for ever and ever : for wisdom and might are his : and he changeth the times and the seasons ; he removeth kings, and setteth up kings ; he giveth wisdom to the
- 22 wise, and knowledge to those who are intelligent : He revealeth the deep and secret things : he knoweth what

- is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him.
- 23 I thank and praise thee, O God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee: for thou hast made known to us the king's matter.
- 24 Therefore, Daniel went in unto Arioch, whom the king had appointed to destroy the wise *men* of Babylon: he departed and said thus to him: Destroy not the wise *men* of Babylon: bring me in before the king, and I will show the interpretation to the king.
- 25 Then Arioch brought in Daniel before the king in haste, and said thus unto him, I have found a man of the captives of Judah, who will make the interpretation known to the king.
- 26 The king answered and said to Daniel, whose name *was* Belteshazzar, Art thou able to make known to me the dream which I have seen, and its interpretation?
- 27 Daniel answered before the king, and said, The secret which the king hath asked, the wise *men*, the magicians, the sacred scribes, the astrologers, cannot show to the king; but there is a God in the heavens who revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream,
- 28 and the visions of thy head upon thy bed are these: As to thee, O king, thy thoughts came up *into thy mind* on thy bed, what should come to pass hereafter; and he who revealeth secrets maketh known to thee what shall
- 30 come to pass. But as to me, this secret is not revealed to me for wisdom that I have more than all the living, but in order that the interpretation might be made known to the king, and that thou mightest know the thoughts of thy heart.

## THE DREAM.

- 31 Thou, O king, didst look, and behold a great image. This huge image, whose brightness *was* excellent, stood
- 32 before thee; and its appearance *was* terrible. This image's head *was* of fine gold, his breast and his arms
- 33 of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass. His legs of iron, his feet, a part of them was iron and a part of them
- 34 clay. Thou didst look till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet *that*

- 35 *were* of iron and clay, and broke them in pieces. Then  
was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold,  
broken in pieces together, and became like the chaff of  
the summer threshing-floors ; and the wind carried them  
away, that no place was found for them : and the stone  
that smote the image became a great mountain and filled  
36 the whole earth. This *is* the dream ; and we will tell  
its interpretation before the king.

## ITS MEANING.

- 37 Thou, O king, *art* a king of kings : because the God  
of the heavens hath given thee the kingdom, the power,  
38 and the strength, and the glory. And wheresoever the  
children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the  
birds of the heavens hath he given into thy hand, and  
hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou *art* this head  
39 of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom in-  
ferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which  
40 shall rule in all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall  
be strong as iron : forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces  
and crusheth all *things*, and like iron that shattereth all  
41 these, shall it break in pieces and shatter. And whereas  
thou didst see the feet and toes, a part of them of pot-  
ter's clay, and a part of them of iron, the kingdom shall  
be divided ; but there shall be in it of the strength of  
the iron, forasmuch as thou didst see the iron mixed with  
42 miry clay. And *as* the toes of the feet, a part of them  
*was* of iron, and a part of them of clay, *so* the king-  
43 dom, a part shall be strong, and a part broken. And  
whereas thou didst see iron mingled with miry clay, they  
shall mingle themselves with the seed of man : but they  
shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not min-  
44 gled with clay. And in the days of these kings shall  
the God of the heavens set up a kingdom, which shall  
never be destroyed : and the kingdom shall not be left  
to another people, *but* it shall break in pieces and make  
an end of all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.  
45 Forasmuch as thou didst see that the stone was cut out  
of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in  
pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the  
gold ; the great God hath made known to the king what  
shall come to pass hereafter : and the dream *is* certain,  
and its interpretation sure.

- 46 Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell on his face, and  
 47 prostrated himself to Daniel, and commanded that they  
 king answered to Daniel, and said, Of a truth *it is*, that  
 your God *is* a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a  
 48 revealer of secrets, because thou couldst reveal this se-  
 cret. Then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave  
 him many great gifts, and made him ruler over the whole  
 province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all  
 the wise *men* of Babylon.
- 49 Then Daniel requested of the king, and he set Sha-  
 drach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, over the affairs of the  
 province of Babylon: but Daniel *sat* in the gate of the  
 king.

## NOTES.

Verse 2.—“Astrologers.”] Hebrew *Casdim*. This word usually translated Chaldeans, has a special signification, that of astrologers. The nation was particularly devoted to astrology.

Verse 18.—“Rest of wise men,”] or “the remnant of the wise men.”

Verse 32.—“Brass.”] Chaldaic, *nechâsh*. This word, like the corresponding Hebrew *nechosheth*, is used for copper, and likewise for a factitious metal composed of copper and tin, which admitted of being tempered and wrought into armor, spears, swords, and various cutting instruments. The article, which is now termed brass, was unknown to the ancients.

Verse 33.—Although the word “clay” has been retained, yet the original term *chasaph*, (as well as the phrase *chasaph tinah*, ver. 41, “miry clay,”) signifies *baked clay* or *earthenware*, and not *soft clay*, as the English reader might suppose from the language of our common version.

Verse 35.—“Mountain,”] *Toor*. This word signifies either *a mountain* or *a rock*.

## CHAPTER VII.

- 1 In the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, Daniel  
 saw a dream and visions of his head on his bed: then  
 he wrote the dream, *and* told the sum of the matters.
- 2 Daniel spoke and said, I saw in my vision by night,  
 and behold the four winds of the heaven rushed upon  
 3 each other on the great sea. And four great beasts  
 4 came up from the sea, different one from another. The  
 FIRST *was* like a LION, and had eagle’s wings; I  
 looked until its wings were plucked off, and it was raised  
 from the earth, and made to stand on two feet like a  
 man, and a man’s heart was given to it. And behold  
 5 another beast, a SECOND, like a BEAR, and it raised

- up itself on one side, and *had* three ribs in its mouth,  
6 and they said thus to it, Arise, devour much flesh. After this, I saw and behold ANOTHER, like a LEOPARD, and it had four wings of a bird on its back: the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a  
7 FOURTH beast, DREADFUL and TERRIBLE, and exceedingly strong: and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and broke in pieces, and trampled the remnant with its feet: it *was* different from all the beasts that  
8 *were* before it: and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and behold, another little horn came up among them, before which there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and behold, in this horn *were* eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things.
- 9 I looked until thrones were placed, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment *was* white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne *was*  
10 flames of fire, *and* his wheels burning fire. A fiery river flowed and came forth from before him: a thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment sat, and books  
11 were opened. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spoke: I beheld *even* till the beast was slain, and its body destroyed, and given to the  
12 burning fire. As to the rest of the beasts, they had had their dominion taken away: yet their lives had been  
13 prolonged for a season and time. I saw in the night visions, and behold, *one* like a son of man came with the clouds of the heaven, and came to the Ancient of  
14 days, and they brought him near before him. And to him was given dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the people, the nations, and the languages, should serve him: his dominion *is* an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, *that* shall not be destroyed.
- 15 I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of *my*  
16 body, and the visions of my head terrified me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth concerning all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things.
- 17 These great beasts, which are four, *are* four kings,



- 18 *who* shall arise from the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.
- 19 Then I wished to know the truth concerning the fourth beast, which was different from all the others, exceedingly dreadful, whose teeth *were of* iron, and his nails *of* brass: *which* devoured, broke in pieces, and trampled
- 20 the remnant with his feet: And concerning the ten horns that *were* in its head, and the other which came up, and before which three fell; even that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spoke very great things, whose look
- 21 *was* bolder than its companions. I had seen, and the same horn had made war with the saints, and prevailed
- 22 against them; until the Ancient of Days came, and the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.
- 23 Thus he said, The FOURTH BEAST shall be the FOURTH KINGDOM on the earth, which shall be different from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in
- 24 pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom *are* ten kings *that* shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be different from the first, and he shall bring
- 25 down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall oppress the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and law: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the
- 26 dividing of a time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to ruin and to destroy
- 27 *it* unto the end. And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom *is* an everlasting kingdom, and all the dominions shall serve and obey him.
- 28 Thus far *is* the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my thoughts troubled me much, and my countenance changed on me: but I kept the matter in my heart.

## NOTES.

Verse 13.—“A son of man.”] The Chaldaic word *‘ădâr* is not in the *emphatic* state, and hence it is not to be translated “the son,” but “a son.” Though it refers to Christ, still a *literal* translation seems the most proper.

Verse 22.—“And the judgment was given.”] In modern phraseology the idea may be expressed thus—“and sentence was given in favor of the saints,” &c. Rev. xx. 4.

Verse 25.—“Oppress” or “afflict.”

## CHAPTER VIII.

### *Vision of the ram, he-goat, and “little-horn,” which waxed “EXCEEDINGLY GREAT.”*

- 1 In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared to me Daniel, after that which appeared to me formerly.
- 2 And I saw in the vision ; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I *was* at Shushan *in* the palace, which *is* in the province of Elam ; and I saw in the vision, and I
- 3 *was* by the river Ulai. And I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns : and the two horns *were* high ; but one *was* higher than the second, and the higher coming
- 4 up last. I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward ; so that no beasts could stand before him, neither *was there any* that could deliver from his power ; but he did according to his will, and became great.
- 5 And I was considering, behold, a he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground : and the goat *had* a conspicuous horn
- 6 between his eyes. And he came to the ram having two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and
- 7 ran to him in the fury of his power. And I saw him coming to the ram, and he was enraged against him, and smote the ram, and broke his two horns : and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, and he cast him down to the ground and trampled on him : and there was no one that could deliver the ram from his
- 8 power. And the he-goat became very great : and when he was strong, the great horn was broken ; and instead of it came up four conspicuous ones towards the four winds of heaven.
- 9 And from the one of them came forth a little horn, which became exceedingly great towards the south, and
- 10 towards the east, and towards the beautiful *land*. And

- it became great, *even* to the host of the heavens ; and it cast down *some* of the host and of the stars to the
- 11 ground, and trampled on them. Yea, he magnified *himself* even to the prince of the host, and by him the continual *sacrifice* was taken away, and the dwelling of
- 12 his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given *him* against the continual *sacrifice* by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground ; and it practised, and prospered.
- 13 Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said to that certain *saint* who spoke, Until when, the vision, the continual *sacrifice*, and the transgression of the desolator, to give both the sanctuary and the host to
- 14 be a trampling down ? And he said to me, Until two thousand and three hundred days ; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.
- 15 And it came to pass, when I, *even* I Daniel had seen the vision, and sought understanding, then behold, there
- 16 stood before me as the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between *the banks of* Ulai, who called, and said, Gabriel, make this *man* to understand the vision.
- 17 And he came near where I stood : and when he came, I was afraid, and fell on my face : and he said to me, Understand, O son of man : for to the time of the end *shall be* the vision.
- 18 And as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face towards the ground : but he touched me, and made me stand.
- 19 And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation : for at the time appointed the end *shall be*. The ram which thou didst see having the two horns, *signifies* the kings of
- 20 Media and Persia. And the shaggy goat *is* the king of Greece : and the great horn that *is* between his eyes *is* the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up instead of it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not with his power. And in the last
- 23 time of their kingdom, when the transgressors shall have completed *their sins*, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding stratagems, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power : and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and
- 24

- 25 shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And through his cunning also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand ; and he shall magnify *himself* in his heart, and in peace shall destroy many : he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes ; but he shall be broken
- 26 without hand. And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told *is* true : wherefore shut thou up the vision ; for it *shall* be for many days.
- 27 And I Daniel fainted, and was sick *certain* days ; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business ; and I was astonished at the vision, but no one explained *it*.

## NOTES.

CHAP. viii. 1. "After," Heb. achāre. This Hebrew word always signifies *subsequent*, and never *like* or *similar*.

Ver. 2. "Palace.—Heb., Birah. This word signifies a fortress, castle, or fortified palace. The phrase "Shushan the palace," often signifies not only the royal palace or citadel, but also the whole city. Esther i. 5 ; ii. 5 ; compare Ezra vi. 2.

Ver. 9. "Beautiful land."—Heb., Tzebi. This word is often joined with "eret," land or earth, as in Dan. xi. 16, 41. So in Dan. xi. 45, "har tzebi kodesh," mount of holy beauty."

Ver. 11. "Prince of the host."—Heb., Sar tzēbā. This is the identical phrase which occurs in Joshua v. 14, 15, where it is rendered in our common version, "Captain of the host." "Continual"—tamid. This word, when used as a substantive, signifies *continuance*, and is employed only in the genitive case after other substantives, as in Ezek. xxxix. 14, "anshe hattamid," men of continuance, that is, "men hired continually," and not for a short period. So it is used in Ex. xxx. 8, ketoreth tamid, "a perpetual incense," or literally, "an incense of continuance." Num. iv. 7, "lechem hattamid,"—"the continual bread," or "bread of continuance." So in Ex. xxix. 42, olath tamid, "a continual burnt offering." The same phrase is found in Numbers xxvi. 6, 10, 15, 23, 24, in all which cases the literal translation is, "the burnt offering of continuance." Strictly speaking, there seems to be but one instance in which it is an *adjective*, viz., Prov. xv. 15, "mishteh tamid," "a continual feast." It is frequently used as an adverb, as in Ps. xvi. 8, xxv. 15, xxxiv. 1. It is a singular fact that in Daniel, tamid (or with the article, hattamid) is used without any qualifying word, such as *sacrifice*, *burnt offering*, &c. Hence it simply signifies here the continual or the continuance. In this chapter it seems probable that the word "sacrifice" has been correctly supplied by the translators. The context justifies this, but this may not be so, in subsequent passages.

Ver. 11. "Dwelling"—mecôn—or "habitation." The phrase may not be improperly translated, "his holy habitation."

Ver. 12. "A host was given *him*," we tzaba tinnāthēn, or "a host was delivered up."

Ver. 14. "Until two thousand three hundred days." Heb., "ad ereb boker alpayim ūshelōsh meōth," literally "until evening-morning two thousand three hundred." That the phrase "evening-morning" is used

like the Greek *nuchthemeron*, "night-day," for a day of twenty-four hours, will be obvious by a comparison of Gen. i. 5, where the same words occur.

Ver. 14. "Cleansed," *nitzdak*, the niphil or passive form of the verb "*tzadak*," to be right, just, &c. Although some have proposed the translation of "shall be avenged," in the place before us, still "be cleansed" would seem equally appropriate.

Ver. 27. "Explained."—Heb., *Mabin*. This participle is in Hiphil in the *causative* conjugation, and might with equal propriety be rendered "was causing to understand."

## CHAPTER IX.

### *Daniel's Confession and Prayer, and Gabriel's Visit to teach him understanding in the Vision.*

- 1 In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of  
the seed of the Medes, who was made king over the
- 2 kingdom of the Chaldeans ; in the first year of his reign  
I Daniel understood in the books the number of the  
years, concerning which the word of JEHOVAH came to  
Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy  
years in the desolations of Jerusalem.
- 3 And I set my face to the Lord God to seek by prayer  
and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes :
- 4 and I prayed to JEHOVAH my God, and confessed, and  
said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the  
covenant and kindness to those who love him, and to
- 5 those who keep his commandments ; we have sinned,  
and have acted perversely, and have done wickedly, and  
have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and
- 6 from thy judgments: neither have we hearkened unto  
thy servants the prophets, who spoke in thy name to our  
kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people
- 7 of the land. O Lord, righteousness *belongeth* to thee,  
but to us shame of face, as at this day ; to the men of  
Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to all  
Israel *that are* near, and *that are* far off, through all the  
countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their
- 8 trespass that they have trespassed against thee. O Lord,  
to us *belongeth* shame of face, to our kings, to our prin-  
ces, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against
- 9 thee. To the Lord our God *belong* mercies and for-  
givenesses, though we have rebelled against him ; neither
- 10 have we obeyed the voice of Jehovah our God, to walk

- in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the  
11 prophets. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law,  
even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice ;  
therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the imprecation  
12 that is written in the law of Moses the servant of  
God, because we have sinned against him. And he hath  
confirmed his words, which he spoke against us, and  
against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us  
a great evil : for under the whole heaven hath not been  
13 done as hath been done on Jerusalem. As it is written  
in the law of Moses, all this evil hath come on us : yet  
have we not entreated the face of Jehovah, that we  
might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth.  
14 Therefore hath the Lord watched over the evil, and  
brought it on us : for Jehovah our God is righteous in  
all his works which he doeth ; for we obeyed not his  
15 voice. And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought  
thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty  
hand, and hast gotten thyself renown, as at this day ; we  
16 have sinned, we have done wickedly. O Lord, accord-  
ing to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine  
anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusa-  
lem, thy holy mountain : because for our sins, and for  
the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people  
17 became a reproach to all who are around us. Now  
therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant,  
and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine on thy  
18 sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my  
God, incline thine ear, and hear ; open thine eyes and  
behold our desolations, and the city which is called by  
thy name : for we do not present our supplications be-  
fore thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies.  
19 O Lord, hear ; O Lord, forgive ; O Lord, hearken and  
do ; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God : for thy  
city and thy people are called by thy name.  
20 And while I was speaking, and praying, and confes-  
sing my sin, and the sin of my people Israel, and pre-  
senting my supplication before Jehovah my God for the  
21 holy mountain of my God ; while I was speaking in  
prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the  
vision formerly, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me  
about the time of the evening offering.  
22 And he made me understand, and talked with me,

- and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to teach thee  
 23 understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications  
 the commandment came forth, and I am come to shew  
*thee*; for thou *art* greatly beloved: therefore understand  
 24 the matter, and consider the vision. Seventy weeks  
 have been cut off upon thy people and upon thy holy  
 city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of  
 sin-offerings, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to  
 bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal the vision  
 25 and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know  
 therefore and understand, *that* from the going forth of  
 the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem to  
 the Messiah the Prince, *shall be* seven weeks, and sixty  
 and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the  
 26 trench, even in troublous times. And after the sixty and  
 two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself:  
 and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy  
 the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof *shall*  
*be* with a flood, and to the end of the war desolations  
 27 are determined. And he shall make a firm covenant  
 with many one week: and in a part of the week he shall  
 cause sacrifice and offering to cease, and for the over-  
 spreading of abominations, he shall make *it* desolate,  
 even until the consummation, and that determined shall  
 be poured upon the desolate.

## NOTES.

CHAP. ix. 21. "Being caused to fly swiftly"—*mûâph bêâph*. These words may be translated "wearyed by going swiftly." In this case, the root is not *ûph*, to fly, but *yâph*, to run or move swiftly.

Ver. 24. "Have been cut off,"—*nechtak*—*niphe* form of "*chathak*." This verb occurs in no other instances in the Hebrew Bible. In Chaldaic it has the signification to cut, cut off, &c. In the Chaldeo-Rabbinic Dictionary of Stockius, the word *chathak* is thus defined:

"*Scidit, abscidit, conscidit, inscidit, excidit*"—To cut, to cut away, to cut in pieces, to cut or engrave, to cut off. In the same work, he gives the substantive under three forms, derived from this verb, *chethek*, *chittuk*, and *chathikah*, rendered *csaura*—a cut, *incisio*—an incision, *excisio*—a cutting off, *segmentum*—a slice, *pars secta*—a part cut off. Mercerus, in his "Thesaurus," furnishes a specimen of Rabbinical usage in the phrase, "*châthikah shelbasar*," a piece of flesh, or "cut of flesh." He translates the word as it occurs in Daniel ix. 24, by "*præcisa est*"—was cut off.

In the literal version of Arias Montanus, it is translated "*decisa est*," was cut off; in the marginal reading, which is *grammatically* correct, it is rendered by the plural "*decisæ sunt*"—were cut off.

In the Latin version of Junius and Tremellius, *nechtak* is rendered "*decisæ sunt*"—were cut off.

Again, in Theodotion's Greek version of Daniel, which is the version used in the Vatican copy of the Septuagint as being the most faithful, it is rendered by *sunetmethēsan*, "were cut off," and in the Venetian copy by *tatēntai*, "have been cut." The idea of *cutting off* is pursued in the Vulgate, where the phrase is "abbreviatæ sunt," "have been shortened."

Thus Chaldaic and Rabbinical authority, and that of the earliest versions, the Septuagint and Vulgate, give the single signification of "cutting off" to this verb. Should it be inquired why a tropical sense has been attributed to it, such as "determining" or "decreasing," it may be answered that the reference of the verse (in which it occurs) to Dan. viii. 14, was unobserved. It was therefore supposed that there was no propriety in saying "seventy weeks are cut off," when there was no other period of which they could have formed a portion. But as the period of 2300 days is first given, and verses 21 and 23, compared with Dan. viii. 16, show that the ninth chapter furnishes an explanation of the vision in which Gabriel appeared to Daniel, and of the "matter" (the commencement of the 2300 days)—the literal (or rather, to speak properly, the *only*) signification demanded by the subject matter, is that of "cut off."

"Vision and prophecy," literally, the vision and prophet, or in other words, the prophetic vision.

Ver. 25. "Trench,"—Heb., *chārūtz*—derived from the verb *chāratz*, to cut, cut in, dig. Hence it signifies the trench or ditch of a fortified place.

Ver. 27. "Covenant with many"—or literally, "He shall make a covenant for many."

"For the overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate." This translation rests on the authority of Rabbi Kimchi. The earliest translators give the passage a very different version. Vulgate—"And the abomination of desolation shall be in the temple." Septuagint—"And on the temple the abomination of desolations." Either of these translations corresponds better with the original than our common version, and the words of the Savior, Matt. xxiv. 15, "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place"—these words (evidently quoted from the Hebrew,) would seem to be decisive on this subject.

The Hebrew *weal kenaph shikkūtīm meshōmēm*, literally rendered is, "And on the pinnacle, (i. e., of the temple,) abominations (or idols) the desolator."

The word "kanaph" has the signification of "wing," and derived from it, those of extremity, corner, skirt of a garment, corner or end of the earth, the highest point, pinnacle, or battlement of the temple. In the case before us, the part is put for the whole. Hence the Septuagint, "on the temple."



## ARTICLE IX.

*Prophetic Use of a Day for a Year.—The New Theory of Interpretation.*

It is well known that the *theory* which teaches us that the prophets never reckon a *day* for a *year*, stands opposed to the judgment of almost every Protestant commentator, notwithstanding it has been approved by Romanists, though not with all the latitude, which is now claimed for its application. It is not difficult to ascertain the origin of the partiality of Papal writers for this theory. If they are allowed to apply various predictions respecting the rise of a persecuting power, which should make war and prevail against the saints, to Antiochus Epiphanes, or to Pagan Rome, then much of the prophetic language, which has been hitherto supposed to bear with irresistible force against their church, can be no longer employed to describe its rise, progress, or fall. Hence, we find Rollin, Jahn, and others of that church, interpret Daniel in harmony with this view. Among the Protestant commentators are Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Thomas Newton, Bishop of Bristol, Faber and Scott. This theory has been strongly advocated by the German Neologists, such as Eickhorn, and others. The motive of these men is quite obvious. They deny *the inspiration* of the Scriptures. Being well aware that prophecy is regarded as an invincible proof of inspiration, they have labored to bring the prophetic writings into contempt, and to represent their authors as idle dreamers, whose visions and predictions were unworthy of any serious regard. It has long been supposed, that the irreligious characters of these men might be a sufficient guarantee, that their sentiments should not obtain a currency among those, who are termed Evangelical Christians in this country; but it seems that this confidence was not well founded. The theory to which we have referred, has been adopted by Prof. Stuart in his "Hints," repeated by Prof. Stowe in his pamphlet "On the Utter Groundlessness of all Millennial Arithmetic," and others of minor note.

The high position, which Prof. Stuart occupies as a Hebrew scholar, has led many to adopt his sentiments without

much reflection or examination. The results which legitimately flow from the theory, are such as have already produced some alarm among the "Orthodox," who, while they strenuously contend that the calculations of Mr. Miller are wrong, are still unwilling to believe that the prophecies of Daniel terminate with the cleansing of the temple by Judas Maccabeus, or that those of the Apocalypse did not reach much beyond the death of Nero. In short, there are a few among the enemies of Adventism who see the gulf, which is open at their feet, and hesitate to make the plunge, even for the sake of proving that Adventists are fools and fanatics. "A prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself."

But whatever may be thought of the origin of this theory, I deem it worthy of an examination. If it is sustained by the oracles of truth, let it be believed—if not, let no deference for names or talent lead any man to embrace it. Eternal interests are not to be hazarded on mere human authority.

I submit the following results of an examination of the Bible in reference to this subject.

1, The word "day" is used in the plural for a year, by the *historical* writers, as well as others, in the Old Testament.

Lev. xxv. 29.—"then he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold: within a full year may he redeem it."

וְהָרְחָה נְאֻלָּתוֹ עַד-שָׁנָה מִמִּכְרוֹ יָמִים תְּחַרְחֶה נְאֻלָּתוֹ

Here יָמִים *yámin*, "days," (the plural of יוֹם *yóm*) translated a "full year," evidently designates the same period as שָׁנָה "*Tóm shenath*," "a whole year," (literally "the completion of a year.")

Judges xvii. 10.—"ten *shekels* of silver by the year"—עֶשְׂרֵת כֶּסֶף לְיָמִים

In this instance we find יָמִים used with the preposition לְ Lamed ("for") translated "by the year."

2 Chron. xxi. 19.—"after the end of two years"—

וַיָּבֹטֶה צֶאֱחַ חֶסֶף לְיָמִים שְׁנַיִם

It is worthy of notice in this case, that יָמִים the plural, is used for *years*, as the next word שְׁנַיִם "*shanayim*," *two years*, clearly shows; and such is the translation given by Gesenius in his Lexicon. Now, then, we are furnished with an instance where a historical writer would lead us to the conclusion that יוֹם *yom*, day (in the singular,) might be employed for *a year*, inasmuch as its plural evidently signifies *years*.

Amos iv. 4.—“after three years:” לְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים (literally, “after a triad, or a three of years.”)

Numb. ix. 22.—“Or whether it were two days, or a month, or a year”—אוֹרֵי יָמִים אוֹ חֹדֶשׁ אוֹ שָׁנָה

1 Sam. xxvii. 7.—“a full year and four months”—יָמִים וְאַרְבַּעַת חֳדָשִׁים

No good reason can be given for using “a full year,” instead of the term, “a year,” in this case. The same usage prevails in reference to the phrase “year by year,” or “yearly”—1 Sam. i. 3—מִיָּמִים רִמְיָמָהּ. In the seventh verse, we find the equivalent expression שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה *Shanah beshanah*—being the usual word for *year*.

These quotations prove the proposition. As they exhibit a peculiar idiom in the language of the inspired writers, they allow us also to infer that to employ the word *day* as the representative of a year, especially by prophetic writers, whose style is certainly somewhat peculiar, would not appear to their Hebrew countrymen quite as absurd as some men of later times have imagined.

2. We find that the prophets have used *peculiar terms* to designate time, which are not employed in *historic style*. For instance, the word מוֹעֵד (*Môéd*) in the historic style indicates a *set time*—an appointed season—an assembly or congregation—a festival—a festive offering; but the prophets have employed it for a *year*, thus, Dan. xii. 7, “For a time, times and a half,” לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וְחֵצִי *Lēmôéd móädim wáchêtzî*. Compare this with the prophetic usage of language in Rev. xii. 14—“for a time, and times, and half a time” καιρὸν καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ. See also verse 6th of this chapter—“a thousand two hundred and threescore days”—ἑξήκοντα χίλις διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα. The context shows that “a time and times, and half a time,” is equal to “a thousand two hundred and threescore days”—especially when Rev. xi. 2, 3, teaches us that “forty-two months” (reckoning the month at thirty days) are equal to 1260 days, or three years and a half. The *prophetic* use of the Greek word καιρός, which, in the *historic* style, signifies a *point or period of time*—a *definite or set time*, is precisely similar to that usage in the Old Testament, when מוֹעֵד indicates a *year*. The Greek in the passage just cited from Rev. xii. 14, is translated in the Peshito Syriac, (the earliest version of the New Testament,) Edónó wédóné úphelgúth édónó—“a time and times, and a

division of time." In the Chaldaic portion of Daniel, the word עִדָּן, *iddán* which, in *historic style*, merely signifies *time*, is employed to signify *a year*. Gesenius, in his Hebrew and Chaldaic Lexicon, gives *a year* as an especial signification of this word in Daniel iv. 16, 23, 25, (in the original, these verses are numbered 13, 20, 23 and 29.) In these passages, שִׁבְעָה עִדָּנִין *Shibáh iddánin*, is *literally* rendered in our version, "seven times."

Josephus, in his Antiquities, 13, B. cap. 10, sec. 7, makes the following remark respecting Nebuchadnezzar: "A little after this, the king saw in his sleep again another vision, how he should fall from his dominion and feed among the wild beasts, and that when he had lived in this manner, in the desert, for *seven years* he should recover his dominion." In Daniel vii. 25, we find the Chaldaic phrase עַד־עֵדֶן וְעַד־עֵת וְעַד־עֵת *ad-eden ve-ad-et ve-ad-et* "until a time and times, and the dividing of time." The agreement of this sentence with the Hebrew of Daniel xii. 7, and the Syriac of Rev. xii. 14, is obvious at the first glance.

These authorities, then, prove that the prophets, in predicting future events, employ the word *time* to signify a year, and that this usage is *peculiar* to them. In those instances where they write *historically*, they use words to designate time, like other writers in the same language, whether it is Hebrew, Chaldaic or Greek. Should we find another word besides בָּיִת, עֵדֶן or *aiqos*, employed in prophetic usage to mark time, by the prophets, it would be in accordance with a practice which has already been shown to exist, in their writings, nor would such a fact present an absurd anomaly, as some late authors have asserted.

The language which occurs in Daniel ix. 24, if compared with historical testimony and with the Scriptures, proves that *days* are used for *years*, by the prophet, "Seventy weeks"—(שִׁבְעִים שָׁבָעִים—*Shábúim shibim*—"weeks seventy")—are determined (נִכְתָּק—*nechtak*—"cut off") upon thy people and upon thy holy city, &c. The 25th verse fixes the commencement of these weeks at "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." This commandment was given in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, B. C. 457. See Ezra vii. Those who have fixed on the commission granted to Nehemiah in the 20th year of this king, still reckon the same period of time with others, who fix on the

seventh year. In short, all agree that 490 years expired from the going forth of the commandment until the crucifixion, when the Savior "made reconciliation for iniquity," and they are equally agreed in reckoning each day of these seventy weeks as a year. Unless this is done, the prophesy would be absolutely falsified. Now it is worthy of notice, that our version is strictly literal. There is no qualifying term in the Hebrew, connected with *Shabûim* "weeks," nothing in the passage like "weeks of years." The advocates of "the new theory," aware that this passage is fatal to their views, have labored to get rid of its testimony by a criticism on the word "week," which is equally novel and ill-founded. They tell us that the word שבוע (*shábúa*, or שבוע *shēbúa*, in the masc.) construct form, שבוע, dual שבועים *shēbúayim*, plural שבועים *shábúim* — feminine plural שבועות *shábúóth*,) merely signifies *seven*, and of course that its plural signifies *sevens*. Hence, say they, the word, if employed in the sense of our English word *week*, must be followed by the word *days*, and that in such cases, it would imply "a seven of days."

Now I maintain, that with the exception of a single passage in Ezek. xlv. 21, which will be noticed hereafter, Hebrew usage does not afford a *shadow* of proof in favor of this criticism, and that even this passage, on examination, will be found to give them no aid; that the Hebrew word "*shábúa*" has *precisely* the same signification with the English word "week," and like that word, it signifies a period of *seven days*. An English reader, on perusing the assertion made by the friends of "the theory," would conclude that there was not in Hebrew any appropriate word for *week*; in short, that such was the poverty of their language, that the Jews were compelled to use the phrase, "seven days," or "a seven of days," when they wished to express the idea, which we can convey by the single word *week*. Nothing can be more false than such a supposition.

To make this apparent, it may be proper to state, that the word "days," (*yámim*,) is used *pleonastically* after words designating a *definite* portion of time. Gesenius, the Hebrew Lexicographer, under the word יום, (*yóm* — "day,") says, "ימים (*yámim*,) in the accusative is often put *pleonastically* after words designating a certain and definite time." Thus, in Gen. xli. 1, "two years," (E. V., "two full years,") is expressed in Hebrew, by *shēnát hayim yámim*, literally "two

years *as to days*." So in Gen. xxix. 14—"the space of a month," "chodesh yamim"—literally "a month as to days." See Deut. xxi. 13; 2 Kings xv. 13. In Daniel x. 2, *shēlō-shāh shēbūim yāmim*, "three weeks *as to days*," E. V., "three full weeks." Daniel x. 3, *shelosheth shēbūim yamim*—"a three of weeks *as to days*." In these and similar cases, it is obvious that *days* is used simply with the sense of *time*, as a correct translation would properly be "a time [or space] of two years," "a time of three weeks," &c. The same kind of logic used by the new interpreters to prove, that because the word "days" may *sometimes* be found in connection with shebuim, (weeks,) that therefore it merely signifies *sevens*, would also prove, that the word translated *month* or *year* had no definite signification unless followed by *days*. In all the passages, which have been quoted (and many more might have been added,) the word *yāmim* is not in the genitive, but in the accusative case, the word, which immediately precedes it, not being in the construct form.

It is true that the word שִׁבְעָ (feminine gender,) *shēbā*—and שִׁבְעָה (masculine,) *shibāh*, *seven*, has the same radical letters as the word *shābūa*, *week*, that the latter is a derivative of the former; but the new theory would lead the English reader to believe that they are *identical*, which is not true.

In the construct form, שִׁבְעַ, *shēbā*, becomes שִׁבְעָה, *shēbā*—"a seven of," while שִׁבְעָה, *shibāh*, becomes שִׁבְעִים, "a seven of." The plural of שִׁבְעַ is שִׁבְעִים, "*shibim*," (not *seven*, but) *seventy*. It is worthy of notice, that the *plural* forms of the numerals (if we except אֶחָד, *échād*, *one*—plural, אֶחָדִים, *ēchādīm*, *ones*, or *certain ones*, and עֲשָׂרִים, *ēsārōth*, *tens*)—always represent *ten times* as much as the *singular*; hence שָׁלֹשׁ, *three*, in the plural form, is שָׁלֹשִׁים, *thirty*, not *threes*. To express the idea of *threes*, the Hebrews would repeat the ordinal thus, שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁלֹשׁ—*three, three*—or, "by threes." Thus, Gen. vii. 2, "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens"—שִׁבְעָה שִׁבְעָה *shibāh shibāh*—*seven seven*, and so in all similar cases.

The result of these facts is that *week* and *seven* are distinct words in Hebrew—as distinct as they are in English, Latin or Greek; that in Scriptural usage, they are never confounded or interchanged, and that the assertion, which would lead us to suppose the contrary, is not supported by proof.

I shall now quote the passages where *week* or *weeks* occur in the Hebrew Testament, and also some in which such phrases as *seven days*, &c., occur, that we may arrive at a result founded on facts.

Deut. xvi. 9 — “Seven weeks (שָׁבָעָה שָׁבֻעֹת, *shibáh shábú-óth*) shalt thou number unto thee: begin to number the seven weeks (*shibáh shábúóth*) from such time,” &c. Now if the “theory” were true, and *shábúóth* signified merely *sevens*, the qualifying word *yámim*, days, ought to be used after *shábúóth*, which is not the fact. In this chapter we have “seven days” in verses 3, 4, 13, 15, here expressed in Hebrew by שָׁבָעַת יָמִים, *shibath yámim*, “a seven (*heptade*) of days.” So in verses 10, 16, we have the phrase “feast of weeks” expressed by חַג שָׁבֻעֹת *chag shábúóth*. In this case, had it been the design of the writer to say “feast of seven days,” the words would have been “*chag shibath yámim*.”

Genesis xxix. 27, 28 — “week,” *shēbúā* — without any qualifying term like *days*, which would certainly have been necessary, if *shēbúā* signified *seven*, or a *seven*.

So in Levit. xii. 5 — “two weeks” is the proper translation of the dual number, שְׁבַעִים, *shēbúáyim*. Numb. xxviii. 26 — “your weeks,” שְׁבַעֲתֵיכֶם, *shabúóthékem* — by comparing this verse with Levit. xxiii. 15, it will be seen that “weeks” has reference to the period of שְׁבַע שַׁבָּתוֹת, *shēbā shabbáthóth*, “seven sabbaths.” Jer. v. 24 — “appointed weeks — שְׁבַעֹת, ‘*shēbúóth*’ — of harvest.” No qualifying term occurs here.

The phrase “feast of weeks” occurs in Exod. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10, 16; 2 Chron. viii. 13, without the word “days.” In Heb. חַג שָׁבֻעֹת, *chag shabúóth*.

In the prophesy of Daniel, *week* and *weeks* occur in the following passages. Daniel ix. 27, (twice), “week,” שָׁבֻעַ, *shabúa*. Daniel ix. 24 — “seventy weeks,” שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים, *shabúim shibím*. Verses 25, 26; threescore and two weeks, שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים שְׁנָיִם, *shabúim shabuim úshēnayim*. Verse 25 — seven weeks — שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים, *shabúim shibah*. In none of these cases does the word *days* or *year* occur, as must have been the case if *shebua* merely signified *seven*.

Two other cases occur in this prophesy, in which *shabúim* occurs, both referring to the very same period of time, viz. Dan. x. 2, שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבָעִים יָמִים, *sheloshah shebuim yamim*. Here, although the word *days* occurs, it is used, as has already been

noticed, *pleonastically*, and merely signifies *as to time*. If the idea designed to be conveyed had been "three sevens of days," then shebuim must have had a *construct form*, *shebûé* — שֶׁבֻעֵי — although no instance of such a form of this word is found in the language. The other case occurs in Dan. x. 3, which differs from the last quotation only in placing *three* in the *construct* form, "shelosheth," so that the phrase signifies "a three of weeks as to time."

I now come to the only passage in which שֶׁבֻּוֹת *shabúóth* occurs, in which "the new theorists" find a plausible argument for their scheme. Ezek. xlv. 21, "In the first *month*, in the fourteenth day of the month, ye shall have the pass-over, a feast of seven days — חַג שֶׁבֻּוֹת יָמִים 'Chag shēbúóth yamim,' unleavened bread shall be eaten." It may be said that as shebuoth is in the construct form, yamim must be in the genitive, and that as the feast of the passover lasted only seven days, shebuoth must certainly signify "sevens," instead of "weeks," more especially as we read in the 23d verse, "and seven days of the feast" — שִׁבַּת יְמֵי חַג *shibath yemé hechag*." I have thus presented a view of the strong-hold of the "theorists," yet, it is strong only in appearance. Shabuoth, in this case, is merely an instance of anomalous orthography, such as occurs in various parts of the Hebrew Testament; and is quite familiar to all biblical scholars. Numerous anomalies of this kind may be found in the writings of this very prophet. Thus, in Ezek. xiv. 5, we find נֶאֱנֶה *nañéhi*," used instead of the future of אָנֶה *añeh*." "I will answer," compare xiv. 5, כַּח *cach* for לַחַח *lacach*, &c. Now, in the passage before us, שֶׁבֻּוֹת יָמִים "*shēbúóth yamim*" is an irregular orthography for שִׁבַּת יָמִים "a seven of days" (*shibath yamim*.) In proof of this, I adduce a case of the *very same kind* in this chapter, verse 7th. "And the length *shall* be over against לְעֻמּוֹת 'lēummóth,' one of the portions," &c. Here the word leummoth, "over-against" is used, as every Hebrew scholar will allow, for the usual form לְעֻמָּה the construct form of עֻמָּה "*ummah*," which as a noun signifies, a conjunction or joining — and with the preposition lamed (ל) prefixed, "over-against."

Hence, in various translations we find the phrase shebuoth yamim, in this passage *only*, correctly rendered "seven days," because the word "shebuoth" is an anomalous orthography



for shibath — “a seven of.” In the *Thesaurus Linguae Sacrae* of Pagninus, edited by Mercerus, the following remark is made on this passage: “Solennitas שִׁבְעָה יָמִים hebdomadae dierum infermentata comedentur, *quod est sicut solennitas שִׁבְעָה septem dierum.* [ut licet plurale sit, tamen pro singulari habeatur, hoc est pro semel septem tantum.] Et enim שִׁבְעָה per cholem, sicut שִׁבְעָה per Pattach; et sic habet Targum; *septem dierum,*” &c. “A solemnity (solemn festival) of a week of days, unleavened bread shall be eaten,” which is the same as “a solemnity of seven days,” although it (shebuoth) is plural, yet it is used for the singular, that is, for once seven (a week) only. Also שִׁבְעָה has Cholem as שִׁבְעָה has Pattach, and thus the Targum (Chaldaic Paraphrase) has “seven days,” &c.

The result of this investigation is, that there is not a *single* instance in the Hebrew Testament which can sustain the theory, viz., that the word translated in our version *week*, signifies *seven* or *sevens*.

## ARTICLE X.

### *Exclusiveness.*

ADVENTISTS are often charged with being exclusive in their religious feelings and actions. That some among them may be impeachable under this head, it is not our intention to dispute: but that as a body they stand guilty of this accusation, we do seriously doubt, nay, we unhesitatingly deny it. Our partialities aside, and, candidly, we believe none are more free from a sectional or exclusive spirit. We can only conjecture on what ground this allegation is put forth and endeavored to be sustained.

Have not Adventists as good a right as any other class of religionists, to select for themselves a *name*, by which their peculiar and distinguishing views may be understood? Conscience, the origin and law of all technicalities and appellatives, justifies them in so doing. If this act constitutes their exclusiveness, then, in common with all religious bodies, they

must submit to the sentence pronounced. But let it be borne in mind at the same time, that there are the exclusive Congregationalists: and what right have these to such a name, as though no other church or body of Christians are congregational in their government? There are also the exclusive Baptists, why should these appropriate to themselves this special title, as though no other order of Christians practised immersion? And so we might advance and show how universally, distinctive and exclusive appellatives are employed for different Christian bodies, religious journals and the like. Now there is at least as much propriety in the designation of the term Adventist by us, as there is in the use of like cognomens by others: perhaps more, since the doctrine of our Lord's personal coming again to this earth is questioned by some, and boldly disavowed by others claiming for themselves a place in the evangelical party of the religious world; while on the other hand, Adventists, so called, to a man contend for Christ's literal return. This particular doctrine, as well as that of the Lord's speedy coming again, are not the *only* distinguishing features of Adventism, as all candid readers of their publications will admit. The doctrine has its associate and corresponding views, on which our religious neighbors are divided among themselves, or to which as bodies they have not as yet assented. Thus it will be seen that our designation is not an invidious one—that it serves as a convenient clue to our peculiar class of tenets. We are not, any farther than this, strenuous for any name: we wish we could altogether dispense with one, or be known, as the disciples at Antioch, by that of Christians. There is an evil, arising imperceptibly perhaps, out of the use of such numberless names by the different branches of the professing church. It suggests to the mind of the sceptic and infidel the idea of intricacies and absurdities in the theory of religion, and in the doctrines of divine revelation, as also that of animosities among the disciples of Jesus. And probably it makes the members of these different branches of Christ's family feel their exclusiveness, and that they must care solely for their own particular party.

If, after this, our accusers will prove that we are unworthy of the title attached to us, or that it is improperly bestowed, we are always ready to consider amendments when proposed, and we would take this opportunity to hint, that they suggest a substitute for the one by which we have thus far been known. But do not let them be offended at our name.

Adventists have as good a right as others to *believe* what they honestly and conscientiously understand the Bible as teaching, and that without first asking liberty of the respective churches to which they may have belonged. The church assumes or undertakes to decide what the truth is, and then all who do not subscribe to the principles recognised by them are supposed to be opposed to the truth: or those among themselves who may finally conclude that their views need modification, addition or retraction, have, in the estimation of these respective bodies, fallen from the faith, or become heretical. We think that there is not sufficient credit given to the conscientious motives by which various Christians are led to reject old opinions for new: he who has had the trial of investigating his creed anew, and of parting with it for another, need not be reminded of this. If there be one trial sharper and more intolerable than another, it is that of sifting the opinions in which we have been educated, and which we have revered as religion itself, and of laying early prejudices, convictions, teachings, and the dear sweet friendships with which they are so closely interwoven, all on what is deemed the sacred shrine of truth. Nor is it duly considered that multitudes who associate themselves with the different denominations of Christians, are led to do so, not so much from an enlightened scriptural conviction that the body of Christians to which they are about joining themselves, entertain a larger share of the truth than another; or, in other words, that this particular creed to which they place their signatures, is the most orthodox in the world. No: we have frequently seen church members who never saw or heard the creed of their church read. Young converts more generally regard the various churches as one, and feel as though it is a matter of small importance to which they unite themselves. Considerations of a local or social nature, perhaps, induce them finally to give their preference to this or that church. In some instances, the sole idea of the religious superiority of one people over another, has guided them in the step which they have taken in becoming connected with this or the other church. It is not until the novelty of the connexion has subsided and religious opinions become matters of sober thought, of private and of public consideration, that they begin to see the grounds on which Christians are divided, or until some great doctrine is agitated which may seem to threaten the existence of those on which their own system is based: or final-

ly, until their experience suggests a defect in their professed belief, and then a revolution in doctrine may follow. Once more. It is too often forgotten that there is an intimate and reciprocal relation between grace and knowledge. He who never grows in knowledge can never grow in grace: the converse of this is also true. Therefore just in the proportion that man grows in grace, the field of truth will open before him in ever fresh and living beauties; one newly discovered truth will itself suggest a second, and a second will serve to reflect upon the former, and the influence of all upon the heart will not only sanctify, but awaken a new ambition to progress, in the attainment of divine knowledge. The medium through which truth is perceived, will give complexion to its developement. It is not surprising at all that some church members seem ever correct as to doctrinal subjects, who at the same time are a source of no little uneasiness to their associates in consequence of defects in practice. There is no danger of *their* becoming heretics, for they are too sluggish to listen to new theories in religion, and too idle to work the mines of wisdom. If they are not errorists, it is no virtue of their own. For ourselves we honor that man the most who makes it the labor of his life to seek and hold fast to truth, even though he occasionally fall into some gross extravagance or absurdity, or even though he be under the necessity of recanting to-day what he espoused yesterday. He is more like an honest independent man, and his conscience should be respected, if not his judgment.

We have made these remarks with a desire that they may illustrate the case of Advent believers, and be understood as applying especially to them. And we should be happy to have them received as an apology for their present position, and with a hope that they may mitigate somewhat from the severity of the sentence which is now so generally passed upon them. We are guilty of the crime of having re-examined the ancient landmarks, and scanned anew with particular care the old paths. And wherefore have we so done? We answer: because we believe that we are individually responsible for the manner in which we hold the truth. We feel that however humble we are, we must each render to our God an account both for our faith and for our acts. We could find no bar, here, to which we could submit the various conflicting religious opinions of this day, on subjects of vast importance to every soul of man, with anything like a good confidence that

the decision rendered would be agreeable to God's word. Hence, we have prayerfully sought for the truth, in close retirement with Him who has promised us the guidance of the unerring Spirit to lead us into all truth. Our confidence in the scripturalness of our present views was never so strong before: we feel that now if never before we have a religious system, clear, harmonious and sure as the throne of God. If there be any thing to add or to take from it, we hope to see and to embrace or reject it as the case may be. We did not come to our religious guides to get their opinion of these views before we adopted them, because if for no other reason, we feared the curse of trusting in man rather than God. We have departed in some measure from what is generally received by the church at the present day: but this is no evidence of the truth or falsity of our faith. To be candid, we have been impelled to take what we have for truth until something better could be presented. We have changed our religious opinions on questions in themselves not affecting our salvation, because not that we love to occasion schism in the church, or because we love contention, but because our understandings and our whole souls assent to these as the imperishable doctrines of the Old and New Testament. We have been heartily sorry to be under the necessity of dissenting from the expositions of certain portions of God's word, which have been placed not only in opposition to the reasons of our hope, but, as it seems to us, in direct conflict with those rules of exposition by which evangelical views have heretofore been sustained. Moreover, we are confident that if we have, after all our pains and struggles, taken up with error instead of truth, we are willing this moment to see and confess it. Our hearts have ached as we have received from our opponents, jeers and railings, instead of anything like a scriptural refutation of our views. If we are wrong, we desire that *each point* in which we differ from our brethren, should be distinctly and fairly met, and if possible demolished: this we desire with our whole hearts; and we conceive that kindness to our souls and to the cause of truth, will prompt to such a measure, those who are confident that the truth is with them. Our present is a condition too trying to be occupied any longer than we can see our way to change it for that which is more sure and comfortable. Until we have a better way pointed out, *we must stand fast in our present faith*: adding, that if to think independently, and to believe *each* for

himself, justly entitles a man to the opprobrious charge of exclusiveness, then are we exclusive; but no more so we believe than are others. There are a great number of different denominations of professing Christians: diversity of doctrine, has occasioned this diversity of religious bodies: doubtless each in turn condemns the intolerant, pharisaic spirit of the other: and thus you have the whole body of Christians at war with themselves on the ground of real or fancied exclusiveness. If, therefore, Adventists are exclusive, so are their fellow Christians; so the church has always been; so it was in the days of the Reformation, and so perhaps it ever will be, Exclusive! The infidel charges the whole Christian world with exclusiveness: what then? are we to be frightened from a public avowal of our faith and hope? Never. Exclusive! in some sense every man, every family, every Christian, every church, is exclusive: exclusiveness is a part of our being, it is inseparable from truth, and from our relation to our fellow man; and until our accusers can show us by a practical example, that it is no necessary part of our present imperfect state, we suppose that we shall continue to be exclusive.

Perhaps Adventists may be thought exclusive, because engaged in the defence and promulgation of their favorite opinions. But we are at a loss to see how a fair and kind advocacy and circulation of any beings' views, entitles them to the charge of exclusiveness. That we should entertain such startling opinions as the immediate coming of the Son of Man—the great day of final judgment—the resurrection of the righteous dead and their associate events, and yet consent to be silent on them, how any man in his senses could expect of us, we are not able to divine. And yet some have thought us unkind because we *would* profess our faith on all fit occasions. Our opponents have professed a willingness that we should entertain our belief, providing we would say little or nothing about it. Strange and generous liberality this! Is such a faith worthy the name of Christian? Is it a Protestants', or the blind, submissive faith of a Papist? Should we tamely accede to such proposals, the very stones would cry out against us. If our doctrines be worth anything, they ought to be fearlessly defended and everywhere proclaimed. Nor should it be expected that Adventists would have their opinions opposed without endeavoring to repel every assault, which is made upon the citadel of truth. We are not the enemies but the friends of discussion; all that is asked by us

is fair and equal dealing : we are willing that others should disagree with us if they must, but we desire in return to freely express our disagreement with them, if we must needs disagree. In endeavoring to act up to our faith, we have established presses, opened depositories for the sale of our publications, and printed journals for the purpose of defining and promoting our views. Is it just that we should be reproached with exclusiveness for doing that which is practised by all of our neighbors, with not a single exception. Because our views differ from those of others, is it not possible that purity of motive may actuate us in the execution of means for their promulgation? Has mercenary considerations so mighty an influence over us, that these mainly, or partially, have given birth to our operations. We blush for Christianity, when her professed disciples can seek to weaken the strength of the opinions of others, whether they be Christians or Infidels, by insinuations of this kind. And yet charges like these have been boldly thrown into the faces of those who have stood to give direction to the operation of Adventists. Let a candid community judge *who* are the exclusives among us.

We can only offer in our defence that we are exclusive in common with all Christians. There is the churchman wasting his energies exclusively in vindication of "the succession." There is the Baptist exclusively poring over the dusty tomes of the Fathers, learnedly discanting upon the philology of Bapto and its cognates, and barring from church communion all who do not side with him in his partiality for a particular mode of baptism. And so is every religious and moral body upon earth, on the same ground with ourselves, liable to the sentence of exclusiveness, for not bringing every truth, duty and labor under their purview, instead of fixing their eye mainly on a single point of truth and endeavoring to elevate that over others. If Adventists have given the doctrine of our Lord's coming an undue prominence in their creed, it is because that doctrine has been so long lost sight of by the church and the world ; it is because there is perceived by them such an extreme sensitiveness on the part of the great bulk of the professed ministers of Christ, and of the laity on broaching this doctrine directly or remotely ; because they believe it is a doctrine which stands among the first on the pages of inspiration, and is a doctrine, which Heaven designed should have a prominent position in the final history of the church and of probation.

But while Adventists cannot dispense with the theme of their speedy redemption from the sins and sorrows of earth, while their minds are intently fixed on the grand and thrilling event of the introduction of God's everlasting kingdom, they do not forget that the Bible is a perfect store-house of divine instruction: nay, they have ascertained, to their delightful surprise, that these themes are like a golden chain, made up of separate links to be sure, but each united to the other, so as to form one beautiful and solid whole. We speak not from an extensive observation alone, but from a long experience, when we say that the doctrine of the advent is not a single idea: no man can arrive at the threshold of this tremendous truth without first having solved many a problem on his way thereto. We are sure we speak the experience of thousands, when we say that the Bible, the whole Bible, has of late become to us our dearest treasure: in fact, it has almost displaced from our tables and our libraries all other books. Are we to be condemned because we leave the first principles of the doctrines of Christ, that we may go on to perfection in knowledge? We can only reply to this, that so inspiration has exhorted us to do, and no insinuations of human incompetency to understand the deep things of revelation, or charges of being actuated by a criminal curiosity, shall deter us from the task. It is repeatedly said, that the doctrines of faith and repentance should limit the field of our study and of our toil, as ministers of Christ. Do our friends mean by this to imply that no other doctrines than these are useful—that all beyond these under the sacred lids, are of doubtful import and of questionable importance as themes for pious reflection. When the Great Teacher said "Search the Scriptures," he must have meant the whole word of God. We believe that one chief cause of the instability of the ministerial relation, and of the poor sickly piety of the present day, may be attributed to the narrow scope of the preachers' discourses. There is too little variety in the performances of the pulpit—too little to animate the soul both of speaker and hearer, too little to call out the giant energies of the religious teacher, and to awaken in the humble disciple a holy and exalted enthusiasm for divine instruction. As Christian ministers, we are not faithful to our calling, unless we make the Bible our text-book, become thoroughly acquainted with and baptized into all its glorious doctrines, and are able to lead those who are committed to



our guidance, steadily forward to the highest possible pinnacle of intellectual and spiritual attainment. Adventists are the friends of all truth and of all enterprizes, the tendency of which is to elevate and bless mankind. Many of the reforms of the day were brought into being through their humble exertions. They are the warm friends of the Bible and the Missionary causes ; and to say they are not, is to imply an ignorance of their arduous doings and their personal sacrifices, both at home and afar off. But Adventists feel no authority to promise from these enterprizes what the leaders of them are accustomed to. We say, let the whole machinery of religious and benevolent operation be plied with all its power up to the very last moment of time. We honor those who have so long toiled and struggled in their respective departments of moral and religious effort. But we sometimes fear lest at the day of judgment it be reprovingly said to them, " these things ought ye to have done, but not to have left the others undone." The question whether their crimes will not at last be found greater than their virtues, by making themselves willingly blind in relation to the coming judgment, and diverting the attention of those who are confiding in their piety and wisdom, to duties commendable in their place, but to the neglect of those of infinitely vaster moment. If therefore to become acquainted with all of God's revealed mind and purpose is to be exclusive, then let us remain exclusive : we will bear the charge with pleasure.

One point more and we dismiss the subject. Have not Adventists an equal right with others to constitute themselves into a separate sect or church, if they choose ? If not, then pray who has given to others their right so to do ? Many who are now the first to fear, and the loudest to express their disapprobation of our forming a new sect, only a little while ago, within our own or the memory of our fathers, and when perhaps they had less occasion for it than ourselves, yet did they distract and divide the respective churches in whose communion they then were, and *came out* and organized themselves into separate and exclusive bodies. We shall not question the purity of their motives in so doing, but we want kindly to remind them of the class of feelings which were awakened in their bosoms by the incessant cries of illiberality and exclusiveness from those whose ranks they then deserted ; by so doing, we hope to be spared some of their uncharitable remarks in relation to ourselves. Many, just now, talk as

though the formation of a distinct sect among us, was one of the greatest calamities to be apprehended: "another sect!" "another sect!"—"the body of Christ is already mangled and bleeding by the accumulation of sects." Admitted. But it is in your power by doing *your duty* as Christians and Christian ministers, to put a stop to that which occasions schisms and sects: the sin of sects lies at your own door if anywhere. But Adventists have no wish, no intention, no need of constituting themselves into a distinct body. If as yet, anything has occurred among them bearing a resemblance to organization, the force of circumstances has produced it. Both as ministers and as private Christians, we would gladly have retained both our names and our places with old and dearly beloved friends, had our rights been respected. If in this particular we have seemed exclusive, we must say in defence, others have made us so, contrary to our design or will. Were we a sect, and it depends very much upon the different ideas of men as to what constitutes a sect, it would by no means follow that we must of course be sectarians, as we understand the word in its popular use. Sectarianism, as we conceive, has its home in the heart, and not in the head. Among its developments are a hard and bitter spirit towards others who are not rallied under our own standard, but who are humbly striving to serve the Lord—envy and jealousy, lest other religious bodies should be equally as prosperous as ourselves. That Adventists envy the prosperity of their religious neighbors is not admitted: our hearts are always rejoiced to hear of genuine conversions and of the sanctification of believers everywhere. We have enjoyed such unbounded prosperity ourselves and reaped such extensive harvests, that we have almost pitied those who have had to toil on under so many discouraging circumstances, and have been rewarded with such trifling gains. That Adventists have given utterance to many severe truths, we will admit: that they have often exposed the hollow pretensions, the unblushing hypocrisies, the backslidings, the sins, the scepticism and the infidelity of multitudes in the church who have a name to live, is not denied. But Adventists have felt themselves bound by the most solemn sense of duty so to do. They have felt themselves under a more than ordinary obligation to God to speak the truth plainly and fearlessly. They have spoken of things as they appeared to their vision. And this they have done with the

deepest pain—it has been the sorest trial which has fallen to their lot in the execution of their commission,—it has been like tearing asunder the very heart-strings. It remains to be shown that they have no examples from Scripture for rebuking with great severity the inconsistencies and errors of the professed disciples of Christ. If we have, however, erred, we feel that we have erred on the safe side. Is it said that we have manifested a sectarian or bigoted spirit, by denouncing all who have disagreed with us? We think the charge is untenable; we have intended to condemn those only who, disagreeing with us, close their eyes to the light, and cavil and jeer at the truth. And such characters there are even in the pulpits of the day. We blame no man who has humbly and prayerfully used all the means within his power for ascertaining the truth, but has arrived at conclusions the opposite of our own. Is it said again that we have shown our sectarianism by making the doctrine of the advent a test question. If by this be meant that we have consigned to perdition all who have not taken with us the same view of the prophetic periods, we must deny the accusation, for many of our own beloved number, who have our strongest confidence and love, have differed with us here. Or, is it meant that we have adopted certain principles of doctrine to which others are expected, to assent in order to secure our Christian fellowship: this to some extent is true. But how do we differ in this respect from other religious bodies? Do they not draw up certain articles of faith to which others must subscribe in order to enjoy their confidence and love? An adhesion to these views, is the ground of union; the renunciation of them, the breaking of the bonds by which that union has been preserved. This is proper: but nobody understands that a refusal to this or the other religious instrument, is *prima facie* evidence of heterodoxy, or the annexing of one's name to such and such a creed proof presumptive of orthodoxy? Adventists have reason to fear that many who have espoused and perhaps defended their views with great zeal, will not be known at last as Christians; so also do they hope to meet many around the throne whom they have never known as believers in the Coming One. But they cannot expect to mingle their hallelujahs with those, who here mock at the idea of Christ's coming to judgment, whether it be to-morrow or a thousand years hence. They have no confidence in the piety of those who have no love for the Lord's appearing, and are

smiting their fellow servants who are watching for their Master's return. This number we believe to be *exceedingly large* : for them we have no other feelings but of pure pity ; we believe that a dismal and awful day will speedily overtake them. We pray God to make us exclusively his, by granting us better wishes, better feelings, better prospects and a better reward after the strifes and toils allotted us on earth. If Adventists have adopted a standard by which to judge of Christian character different from that brought to view in the New Testament, then they are not aware of it.

But Adventists *are* exclusive. We distinctly and indignantly repel the charge. Exclusive ! God forbid it. We *have* known what it is to be a sectarian and perhaps a bigot ; we *have* known men after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we no man after the flesh. We repeat it, God forbid that we should be sectarians or bigots ; we have not as yet got over the smart of the cruel lash of sectarian zeal, laid on us by the very hands which a little while ago caressed us, to turn about and pour our sectarian fires upon others. Sectarianism ! Exclusiveness ! the charge comes with an ill grace from those who have branded us with heresy and *treated us as heretics* ! Our accusers have rudely excluded us from their company, and then have had the effrontery to charge us with an exclusive spirit, because we have not continued to eulogize them for their sanctity !! If we know anything of our own hearts, we do love all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth, whether they be of this or the other denomination. Wherever we have met a true Christian we feel that we have met a brother. And now let us ask, if this has not been the head and front of our offending ! An exclusive sympathy and affection have been expected and secretly demanded of us by our very accusers themselves !! Is it not the wish, the aim of the sects to limit their Christian love to those within their own bosom ? Do they love all who truly love Christ irrespective of name or church lines ? Let them answer these inquiries to their own consciences. We have had no little observation and experience on this point. Do they not grieve their affection and regard by the zeal with which the principles and policy of the party are defended. We have often witnessed the neglect and even reproach which many have suffered from them, solely on the ground of some slight change in their religious sentiments, and a change too, which has not abated their religious ardor, or injuriously affected their Chris-

tian characters. Since our own conversion to the Advent faith, we have found to our surprise and hearty sorrow, that if ever we were loved and regarded, it was because we belonged to the *party*: we have learned that it is only necessary to leave the ranks, in order to have affection, confidence and regard, leave us forever. Is this just? Is it Christian? We would give the glory to God when we declare that we are none the less consecrated to Christ; nay, we have had our hearts expand with generous and benevolent emotions for all of God's dear children; we have longed to press them to our hearts, and to beg of them to go anew to Jesus, to get their eyes opened afresh to the truth, to get their souls bathed, yea, swallowed up in the ocean of divine love. But these longing desires are not reciprocated. One might almost suppose that our old friends had become dead to both our temporal and spiritual good—that they imagine we have lost all sensibility—that we cannot now feel a slight or a wrong—that we have no social nature—and no social good to be secured. If *they* are the good Samaritan, *we* have had none of their grateful ointment poured into our lacerated bodies, and bleeding wounds.

But, exclusive! we know not what to make of this strange charge. We have never asked others to yield up any of those tenets which were peculiar to their respective churches, in order to secure our affection and fellowship. Nor have we asked them to leave their respective communions, while they could be *benefited* by remaining with those bodies. Exclusive! the reverse of this is the truth; we should like to see a union, yes an amalgamation of all true Christians, providing it could be consistently effected. Nor should we be tenacious to have this one great Christian community called Adventists: we care not a fraction for the name, nor whether the principles on which this general rally should combine, were of Paul or Cephas. The body might be called Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, or Quaker, or any other cognomen most proper and congenial to the feelings of those composing it. What say our accusers to this kind of exclusiveness: will they give it their approbation? Shall we have their co-operation in bringing about such a glorious union? If not, let them not take the advice amiss, when we invite them to search their hearts, if perchance they may be able to ascertain just the extent and depth of their own Christian

charity, before they condemn the intolerance and selfishness of their brethren.

But we have protracted these remarks far beyond their designed limits, and must conclude them with a single word more. This much we have said in self-defence, and not because it is our wish to write an article on ourselves. We ask for candor in the perusal of our sentiments, we ask for forbearance in view of any and all of our defects, and we ask to be weighed in the same scales with all other religious bodies. The path for *us* to pursue lies before us ; in it we hope to travel forward until the Master shall come. Others may pity us and be ashamed of us ; they may sneer, ridicule, misrepresent and abuse us if they shall choose : we cannot prevent them. But for our single selves we shall go straight forward ; our watchword is *onward* : our aim the pursuit and defence of the clear, solid and holy doctrines of the Bible, and our only ambition the pleasures of a present approving conscience, the smiles of our coming Lord, and the future honors and blessedness reserved in heaven for the faithful. F. G. B.

---

## ART. XI.

### *The Bereaved to the Departed.*

Suggested by hearing a widowed mother, Mrs. Warren Case, of Ohio, relate the story of her sorrows.

#### I.

“ Not without hope we yielded thee, sweet Mary, to thy rest ;  
We gave thee up all trustingly, since thou wert with the blest.  
Yet, Oh ! we missed thy silvery tone—thy voice so sweet and low,  
Which tuned in tender gentleness, like music seemed to flow.  
I missed thy ever gladdening smile, and the beamings of thine eye,  
And I learned in bitterness of soul, that *the beautiful must die.*”

#### II.

Oh how my crushed thoughts struggle back, to the hour we laid  
thee low,  
When I deemed with sorrow overflowed my mingled cup of woe—  
And there were risings of the soul that would not have thee die—  
For thou wert there the joy of life—the sunlight to the eye !  
Thou wert entwined around my heart with tendrils fast, of love,  
And my selfish sorrow murmured when thou wast removed above.

## III.

—At last I whispered “it is well”—submissively could weep  
 To have thee, Mary, leave my side, and sweet in Jesus sleep.  
 But when my first born precious boy, thou darling of my pride,  
 With lingering steps went to the grave, Oh ! then, I would  
     have died !  
 Thou wert the treasure stored within the coffer of my heart,  
 And this broken casket, ’rest of thee, would speedily depart !

## IV.

Within one year two loved ones gone ! my Father is it so ?  
 Oh why dost thou uphold me now, beneath this weight—of woe ?  
 Ah ! how I miss the “model child,” with his pure spirit high,  
 And learn, bereft of brightest hope, that *the idolized must die!*  
 I fear to think, thou precious one ! I fear to think of thee,  
 Lest reason banished from her throne, before my grief, should flee

## V.

Then all that I had borne before, how very light it seemed !  
 I could not count my sorrows o’er, I thought that I had dreamed !  
 —Yet calm and quietly ye passed, sweet children, from my sight,  
 As if, unnoticed, ye would glide into the realms of light;  
 Meek, humble, calm ye would retire, and have no voices stirred,  
 And ye would have no monument, no sound of mourning heard.

## VI.

Again thy hand, Oh Lord ! is laid upon my shrinking form;  
 Oh thou who hast thy way in clouds, in whirlwinds and in storm !  
 The chosen husband of my youth is called, and he must leave  
     me now,  
 But faith serene beams in his eye, and placid is his brow ;  
 His “going hence” how glorious ! it was as when the sun  
 With gilded clouds went down the west, his day of duty done !

## VII.

Fit earnest of the glorious hope in which he went to rest,  
 That he should rise when Jesus comes, with the armies of the blest ;  
 Since at the resurrection morn, “the righteous” all shall shine—  
 In the “Father’s Kingdom” “beam as suns,” with radiance divine;  
 Like a sun was his bright setting; far brighter he will rise,  
 When, from the grave, he goes to meet the Savior in the skies !

## VIII.

And now a voice of comfort soothes—’tis from the “widow’s God,”  
 As to his precious truths I turn, recorded in his word ;  
 “From weeping now refrain thy voice†—now cease thine eyes  
     from tears,

\* Matt. xiii. 43.

† Jer. xxxi. 16.

For the beloved, "there is hope," then banish hence thy fears—  
 "Thy children they shall come again" and join thee in a land,  
 Where are no weeping Rachels—where is no "broken band!"

E. C. C.

## ARTICLE XII.

*Reply to Prof. Bush's "Valley of Vision: or the Dry Bones of Israel revived. An attempted proof (from Eze. xxxvii 1—14,) of the restoration and conversion of the Jews."*

THE title of a book first attracts attention, and from it we naturally form an opinion, more or less definite, respecting the book. Next, we look at the preface, to obtain clearer views of what the author designs to do, and to learn his reasons for so doing. The preface is the title amplified; it more fully expresses the object aimed at by the writer, and is his apology for thus appearing before the public.

Little did we think, when we received "The Valley of Vision," that the title and preface would not correspond.

The very modest assertion that the book is "An attempted proof of the restoration and conversion of the Jews," does not seem well to accord with the terms of undoubted confidence—"the full assurance of faith," that appear in the Prefatory Remarks. For the author says, p. 4. preface: "Under the *full persuasion* that this event," [the restoration of the Jews to Syria, and their ingathering into the church] "is announced in the chapter before us, I propose to enter upon the minute exposition of the vision with which it opens. *My design in this is to endeavor to disclose, from the purport of the prophecy, the probable course of Providence, in relation to the conversion and restoration of the Jews.*" In these passages we have two distinct ideas presented. The first is, "the full persuasion" respecting what "is announced in the chapter:" secondly, the "design" in "the minute exposition of the vision"—this "design" is not "an attempted proof," as says the title, "of the restoration and conversion of the Jews," but an "endeavor to disclose" "the probable course



of Providence" in relation to those events. Evidently, then, it is taken for granted, that they are to occur—a distinct announcement is supposed to be found, and so the "attempted proof" is not needed!

We fully agree with the author, (p. 3, pref.) that in the promise recorded, "And I will remember the land," "the language is of such a nature as absolutely to forbid any kind of spiritualizing interpretation." With him also we concur, that the time of the accomplishment of the promise, is utterly incompatible with that of the literal return from Babylon under the decree of Cyrus. But he says, further, "The announcements bear nothing more unequivocally on their face, than that this re-establishment in the land of Canaan shall be *final* and *permanent*. It shall be succeeded by no subsequent rooting out and dispersion."

Such might be the case, if there were not a day of God, "wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements melt with fervent heat—if the heavens and earth which are now, were not kept in store by the word of the Lord, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men—if the works that are in the earth were not to be burned up." (See 2 Pet. iii.)

The author, after quoting Ezek. xxxvi. 13—15, says: "We do not see how words can be more express than this. If words have meaning, it certainly assures us, that the return predicted is not to be followed by disasters to the inhabitants, such as the land witnessed ages before."

Much less, then, can it be followed by the last end of the indignation—the day of the Lord! Hence, we view the return predicted as the establishment of God's people in an immortal state in the new earth, which, with Heaven's blessing, we hope to be able to prove.

We are pleased with the remarks on time, (p. 4, pref.) to this purport: that we have abundant warrant, from the most accurate researches in prophetic chronology, and the signs of the times, for the belief that the events of Ezek. xxxvii. are about to be fulfilled—and that we are now upon the borders of that sublime crisis. The author thinks the prominent features of this crisis, are the restoration of the Jews to Syria, and their conversion. We believe that it is clearly taught in the "faithful sayings," that it is the gathering of the people of God—all true Christians—to the land promised to the fathers, which is to be possessed in the resurrection. On p. 5, Prefa-

tory Remarks, he gives his reasons, as we suppose, for disregarding this view of it. He says :—

"The burden of this vision [of the dry bones] is so strictly defined by Jehovah himself, as intended to set forth in a figurative way, the restoration of Israel from their long dispersion and captivity—from their political degradation and moral death, that I have not deemed it expedient to dwell upon those spiritual or *christianized* applications of it, which have been used in all ages."

Here we are introduced to the fact that Jehovah "*strictly defines*," "in a figurative way," that which is itself figurative! We would ask, What proof is there that the vision in this case is "figuratively" defined by "Jehovah?" Has he ever done this in any other instance? Again, we learn from the last quoted passage, that the brother deems the literal explanation of the vision of dry bones, "usual in all ages," as a "spiritual or *christianized* application," and not worthy to be dwelt upon in connexion with the more approved modern *Judaizing* mode, by which we must believe that the Lord, in explaining a symbolical vision, makes it still more perplexing, by leaving it in a "mystic" state, figuratively "adumbrating," whatever "the learned Hebrician" and others may desire! We cannot believe that the Holy One of Israel has veiled his revealed word, one figure within another, so that man may make an "accommodated" use of it, and cause it to serve any theory; and this must be the case, if figurative language is figuratively, instead of literally explained. Let us then read the following passages in which the Lord explains the vision to Ezekiel.

"Then said he unto me, Son of man, these bones are *the whole house of Israel*: behold they say, Our bones are dried and our hope is lost: we are cut off from our parts. Therefore, prophesy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." Is not the plain obvious meaning of this portion of Divine Truth, that the whole house of Israel—God's people—will have their graves opened, and be brought into the land of Israel. And since it is an explanation by the Lord, of the vision seen by the prophet, by what authority do we seek for a "hidden and occult" meaning? Thus, while we acknowledge ourselves deeply indebted to the learned author, for his exegetical research in the prophecy, we must beg

leave to dissent from some of his positions; for we can find no instance where the Lord, in explaining a vision or parable, uses figurative language, unless that language is elsewhere defined in the Sacred Volume. In the explanation referred to, commencing with the 11th verse of Ezek. xxxvii., the only expressions which are by any considered as figurative, are "the whole house of Israel," "land of Israel," "I will open your graves and cause you to come up out of your graves." Now, since the two former, "whole house of Israel," and "land of Israel," are explicitly defined in many cases in God's word, and since the opening of the grave, and the coming up of God's people out of the grave, are nowhere between the lids of the Bible *explained* to mean their resuscitation as to temporal and worldly prosperity, we must dissent from such an unauthorized application. First, then, it seems appropriate to settle the question, who are

#### THE WHOLE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.

The Jews said to the Savior, "Abraham is our father." But he answered them, "*If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham,*"—John viii. 39. The Apostle also testifies, that "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel: *neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children:* but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, *these are not the children of God,* but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."—Rom. ix. 6—8. "For the promise that he should be the *heir of the world,* was not to Abraham or his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, *faith is made void, and the promise of none effect.*"—Rom. iv. 13, 14. "They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. iii. Is it in the compass of language to express more plainly, that the true Israelites—the people of God—embrace those, and those only, that are of the faith of Abraham? Then the fact may be farther illustrated by a reference to the *Two Covenants*, one of which being everlasting, was made to the whole house of Israel, and conveyed to them the grant of *the land of Israel*. Gal. iv. 22—31. "For it is written that Abraham had two sons—he who

was of the bond-woman, was born after the flesh : but he of the free-woman, was by promise. [*Explanation.*—Which things are an allegory : for these [i. e. the two sons,] are the two covenants : the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, (Gal. iii. 16—19,) which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem, which now is, and is in bondage with her children, ["made desolate, even until the consummation."] But Jerusalem, which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all, ["all who are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus."] Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh, persecuted him after the spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture : Cast out the bond-woman and her son : for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free."

Thus does the apostle settle the mooted question, of the Jews being the covenant people, showing us that the middle wall of partition, which separates them from the Gentiles, in the sense of conferring peculiar blessings on them, was broken down when Christ came, and there is no longer "Jew nor Greek." In the above allegory, the *two covenants* are beautifully presented, and we trust, if we keep them in view, with their attendant promises, that the veil will in some measure be removed from our hearts, when we "read the prophets." It appears that Ishmael and Isaac are the types of the covenant of the law, and the covenant of faith. As Ishmael was permitted to occupy the place of a son in the family and affections of Abraham, until the heir came ; so it was with the Jews. They were God's "ancient covenant people,"—they had peculiar privileges, "God dealt not so with any nation," "to them were committed the oracles of God," but this was permitted only till "the promised seed should come, which is Christ." The explanation of the covenants of the bond and free, makes the Jews the children of Jerusalem, which now is, and is in bondage with her children. It is evident, then, that Isaac represents the whole house of Israel—all that are Christ's ; and that Ishmael occupied the same place in Abraham's household, that the Jews had in the family of God. Shall we then believe that the son of Hagar is to be restored to the bosom of Abraham's family and possess the inheritance of the child of promise, Isaac ? Shall we load the unbeliev-

ing Jews with all the precious promises, belonging to the "blessed and holy" in the immortal state? Shall we say that *Ishmael* is the heir, come let us restore him to his father's house; to him belong the covenants and the promises—the prophets speak mainly of his restoration—predict that he will ultimately come into the possession of an everlasting estate, and that, here in the flesh? Then shall we pray, May *Ishmael's* kingdom come!

Although we cannot adopt such language as this, still we can pray for those "who have judged themselves unworthy of eternal life," just as we do for other unbelievers. We can even say, Oh that *Ishmael* might live before thee, in the sense of earnestly desiring that the Jews may not abide in unbelief; for God is able to graft in again the broken branches of the olive tree, *if they abide not in unbelief*.

In the prophets, the terms Jacob and Israel, it is evident, generally mean, after the Spirit, the true people of God; nor it is natural to suppose that God would inspire his prophets to promise so much to the "bond men" as would be the case, could we apply all that is said of "Jacob," "Israel," "Jerusalem," and "Judah," to those who are outwardly Jews. By misapplying these terms, we are in danger of undervaluing the redemption which the Son of God has made; for the everlasting covenant was confirmed before, of God in Christ; and if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise—Gal. iii. "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect."—Rom. iv. Still, the participators in both bond and free covenants are mentioned in prophecy. The promises made, that Israel, the Jews, should be restored to their own land, were fulfilled after the carrying away to Babylon, and the seventy years' captivity; and all other promises of the final and permanent inheritance, refer to the gathering of the saints in the resurrection, from the mystic Babylonish bondage of this world, to the New Jerusalem state of the world to come.

Now we come to consider more particularly *the grant of territory* made in the everlasting covenant.

## THE LAND OF ISRAEL.

We trust that all who have accompanied us thus far, will allow that the promises made to Abraham have reference to the two covenants of which Paul speaks:—the temporal, for the Jews, which has been fulfilled; and the eternal, conveying an immortal inheritance to the redeemed. The first promise made to the patriarchs is recorded in Gen. xii. 6, 7. "And Abraham passed through the land, unto the place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh. And the Canaanite was then in the land. And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, 'Unto thy seed will I give this land.'" In Joshua, 21st and 23d chapters, we read that this was fulfilled in the bringing the children of Israel into the land of Canaan. "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it and dwelt therein." Joshua said, "And behold this day I am going the way of all the earth; and ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls, that not one thing has failed, of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you: all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof."

This promise, then, "Unto thy seed will I give this land," pertained to the temporal covenant. Again, we read in Gen. xiii. 14, 15, "And the Lord said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward and southward, and eastward and westward; for all the land that thou seest, *to thee will I give it and to thy seed FOREVER.* As an *everlasting* inheritance cannot be possessed in a temporal state, all the promises of this description must refer to those who are of the faith of our father Abraham; for all they which are of faith, shall be blessed with faithful Abraham." We read, Gen. xvii. 8, "And I will give unto *thee*, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger,—all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting possession!* and I will be their God." This promise was renewed to Isaac, and also to Jacob, as we read in Gen. xlviii., "I will give this land to thy seed after thee, for an *everlasting possession.*"

It is evident that the patriarchs understood that there were two distinct classes of promises, adapted to the two covenants,—the one temporal, and the other eternal—the former

the type of the latter: for Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones. And Abraham, when he was tried, offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called,"—accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead—from whence also he received him in a figure, i. e. Abraham supposed, that in the resurrection God would verify his promise, to him and to his seed. We have, too, the testimony of Stephen, in Acts vii. that "He gave him [Abraham] no inheritance in it, [the land of Canaan] no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet He promised that he would give it to *him for a possession*, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child." And Paul says, Heb. xi. 9, "By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise: desiring a better country, that is, an heavenly." They died in faith, with an innumerable multitude, who "were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country." Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a *better* resurrection—the resurrection of the just, from among the dead, to reign with Christ on the earth. Thus it is evident that the everlasting inheritance of Abraham and his seed, is the immortal state of "the blessed and holy." And that the inheritance is *on this earth*, is explicitly declared in the promise. "For all the *land* which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed *forever*." "And I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee, the *land* wherein thou art a stranger—all the *land of Canaan*, for an *everlasting possession*." This is in accordance with the words of the Savior, "The meek shall inherit the earth;" and also with the testimony of David, in Ps. xxxvii. It is also in perfect harmony with the song of all the redeemed, the whole house of Israel, prophetically heard by John: "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth"—the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness—"in the restitution of all things spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began." For thus saith the Lord God, "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into *the land of Israel*." That this is the literal resurrection of the

righteous, is farther proved from vs. 24, 25, of the same chap. "And David my servant shall be King over them, and they shall have one shepherd; [Jesus the "chief shepherd"] they also shall walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes and do them; and they shall dwell in *the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant*, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and my servant David shall be their prince *forever*. Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them—it shall be an *everlasting covenant* with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my *sanctuary* in the midst of them forever more. My tabernacle also shall be with them; yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people." Parallel with these passages are those found in Rev. xxi. The Revelator has a view of the new heaven and new earth, and the holy city, and then he hears a voice from heaven, saying, "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away."—See Jer. xxxi. 31, and Heb. viii. 10—13. Thus explicitly does the Word of God demonstrate that the land of Israel is in the regenerated earth.

Now turn we to the "Valley of Vision."

#### THE VISION.

Ezek. xxxvii. 1—10. "The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me out in the Spirit of the Lord, and set me down in the midst of the valley which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them, round about: and, behold, there were very many in the open valley: and, lo, they were very dry. And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest. Again he said unto me, Prophecy upon these bones, and say unto them, O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you and ye shall live: and I will lay sinews upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am the Lord. So I prophesied as I was commanded: and as I prophesied,



there was a noise, and behold, a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. And when I beheld, lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above: but there was no breath in them. Then said he unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophecy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord God, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army."

#### EXPLANATION.

Verses 11-14. "Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off from our parts. Therefore prophecy, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves: and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live: and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

Professor Bush in his "Exposition," has given a comparison of the various versions—the Hebrew, Greek of the Seventy, the Targum of Jonathan, the Vulgate, and English versions. For ourselves, we feel deeply indebted to the author, for the labor and research he has evidently bestowed on this subject, and acknowledge that we are pleased with many of his remarks. The following is very beautifully and truthfully expressed, and it is only the application the author makes of it, that mars our pleasure in reading it. It is a part of the commentary on

Verse 2. "*And caused me to pass by them round about.*"—Heb. — — — "*around around,*"—"as if required by repeated circuits to make the most intent survey of these mournful mementoes of mortality—these accumulated relics of what had once been a multitudinous host of living men, fresh in the strength of manhood, acting, hoping, fearing, loving, but now sunk down to a mere ghastly residuum of dried

and withered bones. The image of the lonely traveller, or the meditative sage, walking to and fro amid the ruins of an ancient city, pondering upon its dilapidated palaces, tracing out the course of its crumbling walls, or deciphering its dimmed inscriptions, comes upon the spirit full of sombre and affecting impressions. But what is this when compared with the effect of which we are conscious, when called to contemplate ideally a scene like the present? Here is a prophet of God, standing, not in the midst of mouldering pillars, arches, and towers, but of the ruins of man himself! It is not the relics of the works of his hands which he surveys, but of the hand of his works! The temple may be built again—the prostrate column may be re-erected—the ivy-spread arch may be restored to its grandeur—but what power can rebuild the builder? What resurrection can await the fragments of that glorious structure to which all other structures owe their origin? This is the paramount prompting in the midst of such a scene. This is the grand problem now presented to the mind of the seer. ‘*Son of man, can these bones live?*’” And again, “The condition of the bones was such, moreover, as to indicate, in the highest degree, the hopelessness of their restoration to life. They were not only bare of flesh, but void of moisture. Dried, marrowless, disjointed, and scattered promiscuously here and there, what could be a more expressive type of the triumph of death and dissolution! What conviction more spontaneous than that the very dust on which they reposed might as soon be expected to become animated and formed into living men, as the whitened masses spread around? Nothing short of the same Almighty fiat which originally reared the fabric of the human body from the clay, could be competent to their resuscitation.”

By these remarks we are reminded of passages in Job xiv. “But man dieth and wasteth away, yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. If a man die, shall he live again?” is the inquiry of Job; i.e., Can these dry bones live? Yes, for he answers, “All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. *Thou shalt call*, [the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live,] *and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands.* For I know that my Redeemer

liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet *in my flesh shall I see God.*"

In the commentary on verse 6, commencing "And I will lay sinews upon you," the author says, "*From the particularity with which the several stages of the process are described, it would seem impossible to doubt that something analogous is to be recognized in the order of the fulfillment itself. Indeed, when we turn from the shadow to the substance, nothing would seem more probable, than that the spiritual regeneration of the Jews will be effected in a singularly gradual manner. The influences adverse to their recovery are so numerous and multiform, that it is doubtless no more than a rational anticipation, that they will come by slow and hesitating steps, to the position which they are destined to occupy in the kingdom of the Messiah.*" We recollect that the author (p. 4, pref.) expressed his design "to endeavor to disclose, from the purport of the prophecy, the probable course of Providence in relation to the restoration and conversion of the Jews." Hence, there is a necessity that he should suppose that those events are to occur, as he does in his comments on v. 4, see p. 10. To the following words of the author, we fully respond, making our own application. He says of this passage, "This crowning act of animation is all that remains to be done to transform the fleshly fabric to living men. Till this is effected, they are merely advanced to the condition of Adam, when fashioned from the clay, but before the Lord God had breathed into him the breath of life, by which he became a living soul. Indeed, the slightest glance suffices to evince, that the whole process here described is accurately conformed to the account of the creation of Adam, in the opening of Genesis. The gradual stages of the vivification are portrayed with a continual allusion to that magnificent work, and that doubtless with the design to intimate that nothing short of a power absolutely creative was competent to the proposed result. The omnipotence which originally reared the human body from the dust—which 'fenced it about with bones and sinews'—which 'formed the eye and planted the ear,' is alone competent to build again the ruined fabric, and endow it with vital properties. Such an exhibition of Divine power would indeed lay a basis for the acknowledgment that was to follow:—'And ye shall know that I am the Lord.' " How just this

exposition, and yet how unjust its application to the restoration of Ishmael!

The analogy between the first and the new creation never forced itself so convincingly on my mind, as when reading the above remarks of Prof. Bush.—Adam, the candidate for eternal life, transgressed and died—and so death came upon all men, for all have sinned. But “as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Jesus who was revealed that he might destroy the works of Satan—“sin, death, and the curse”—in the restitution of all things, will bring all his saints with him, for the Lord hath promised, “Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. Yet the author says, p. 13, “The evident scope of the whole *scenical* transaction, as well as the question built upon it, is to intimate the most unlikely deliverance from a state depressed, wretched, and desperate to the last degree.” And on p. 15, in commenting on v. 7, “And as I prophesied there was a noise, &c.” “A process was here described which was to result in the moral quickening of the Jewish race.” But the conjecture about the “voice” p. 15, is sufficiently ingenious, and fanciful, viz., “what are we to recognize in it but the loud and spontaneous *response*, which shall be heard throughout the bounds of Christendom, when the burden of this prophetic announcement, (i. e. Jews’ return) begins to seize upon and demand the attention of the churches!!!”

In the full faith that the chapter announces the restoration of the Jews, the Professor is really eloquent in discoursing on the probable means Providence will use to bring it about. On p. 20, he says, “Let but our own conviction of the high destiny that awaits them, herald theirs, and the work” [“the most unlikely deliverance!!!”] “is virtually accomplished.” Here, in the clear light of Paul’s allegory, we behold Isaac going forth into the wilderness to restore Ishmael to Abraham’s family, maintaining that he is the heir!—Christians insisting that the promise made of God to the fathers, is to be given to the unbelieving Jews in a temporal state, forgetting the hope of the gospel, “that all that are of faith shall be blessed with faithful Abraham in the resurrection.” He continues:—

Verse 8. “And when I beheld, lo the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above, but there was no breath in them.” After speaking of the day

of small things in the beginning of the restoration of the Jews, the author says, "Still they will be but 'a feeble flock,' and the mass of them being actuated by worldly, rather than by religious promptings, will but verify the mystic portraiture of the vision, in presenting to the Christian eye the spectacle of a gathered multitude of human statues formed of flesh and blood, but devoid of animating breath. Indeed, it may safely be affirmed, that this has hitherto been but too faithful an image of Jewish conversions. Even where there has been adequate ground for thinking charitably of the work of grace in their hearts, *still the predominant character of Jewish piety has been timid, wavering and weak. It has not been a piety of life and power.* No specimen of the glowing ardor of a Paul has yet been witnessed. The converted Jew has *seldom evinced a complete disenthralment from the yoke of Rabbinical bondage, even when baptized into the liberty of Christ.* He has almost never appeared walking with erect front and firm tread upon the platform of Christianity."

Too proud is he to humble himself at the feet of Jesus of Nazareth; yet the Professor seems to suppose that when he is coaxed back to Palestine, and loaded with temporal blessings as a reward for unbelief, "actuated by worldly rather than religious promptings,"—he will be in a *very* hopeful condition to receive Christianity! Is it the usual effect of worldly prosperity to soften the heart, and bring to the foot of the cross? Is not the human heart the same, and the Spirit of God the same as they have been, and will they not so continue? Then whatever Jewish conversions have been, will they not continue to be the same while time shall endure? Jesus came unto his own, and his own received him not. The husbandman slew the heir, that they might seize upon his inheritance, and said, "*His blood be on us and our children.*" And so they are branded with the mark of blood, seven fold more deep than Cain's, and are scattered over the earth, a proverb, a sign, and an astonishment.

On p. 24, the author speaks of "*prophetic prayer*"—"prayer founded upon the express promises of Jehovah," respecting the Jews' return and ingathering.—Yes, the whole Christian world are called upon to enlist in this enterprise,—the one of getting 3,163,700 Jews back to the little land of Palestine, where a standing miracle of "corn from heaven," must be interposed, or they will perish. For this consummation, all good Christians are "prophetically" to pray! Every

department of Zion is to be enlisted in this work of supplication, and to contribute its respective quota of hallowed agency in drawing down the influences of the Spirit upon the morally defunct multitudes of Israel. Of a truth the apostle was inspired with prophecy, when he said that in the latter days men would be turned aside to *fables*!

Now come we to the Professor's commentary on the *Explanation* of the vision, made by the Lord himself to the prophet, 11 v.—“Then said he unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel.” He tells us that by “the whole house of Israel,” is meant “the *major* part of the covenanted race!” and he quotes a Talmudical saying, to help support the assertion! Yes, the temporal covenant, made with the literal descendants of Abraham, and long since fulfilled, is made to swallow up “the hope of the promise made of God to the fathers,” that he would open their graves, and cause them to come up out of their graves, and bring them into the land of Israel. Let us keep distinctly in view, that God is *interpreting the vision*, consequently it is literal—as is uniformly the case with the explanations of all visions in the Bible—see Pharaoh's dream, Nebuchadnezzar's dream, etc. And we would ask those who fancy that visions have a figurative interpretation, what is gained by such an interpretation, which must be again interpreted? We are confident that God's explanations of visions and parables are literal, and as our Professor says, “*If we feel ourselves at liberty to evaporate the solid substances here submitted to us, into airy phantoms in the alembic of a spiritualizing interpretation, what portion of Holy Writ can plead exemption from the same process?*” We answer:—None, verily. We shall find ourselves, after the manner of the author, submitting all such passages as the following to the action of the “spiritualizing” crucible. In reference to the time the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity, he says in Isa. xxvi., “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, *and the earth shall cast out her dead.*” The Professor distills this in his “alembic” with the observation that “it is *all but* universally conceded to be the foreshowing, not of a literal, but of a *figurative* resurrection!!” “And when ye see this, your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb.”—Isa. lxi. 14 shares the same fate at

his hands. And then he proceeds to say, "We believe we may safely interpret Dan. xii. 2, of the same period and the same accomplishment:—"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt;" "implying that that which was a national restoration to all [the Jews] should be a spiritual resurrection only to a part."

Of the many evaporations, this grieves us most. We cannot but indulge the hope that a second glance at the prophecies of Daniel will convince the Professor of his mistake. Dan. xii. 1—3, "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the Great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book: and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt: and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." He has a labored exegetical argument, to prove that *this only means the restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, and if we had unbelief enough to receive it, then might we walk through the Bible a sceptic! The time when "those that sleep in the dust of the earth awake," is at the "time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time." Turn we to the image of the four universal dominions of the earth, which were to exist prior to the establishment of God's everlasting kingdom.—Dan. ii. Of the kingdoms of that image, the Babylonish, Medo-Persian, Grecian and Roman, have passed away; and we are in the divisions of the Roman—the toes of the image which have existed more than 1300 years! The question then arises, Where, in tracing the history of the kingdoms of the image, is the "time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, until that same time," to occur? Where, but in the smiting of the image by the stone, the last end of the indignation, when its kingdoms are broken to pieces together, and become like the chaff of the summer threshing floors? For in the days of these kings, (the toe kingdoms) shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall

stand forever. Of this passage, "Behold, they say our bones are dried and our hope is lost," Professor Bush says, p. 33, "Nothing could be more appropriate to express the burden of despondency which the depressed, afflicted, down-trodden condition of the Jews has for ages put into their lips. They are a people sick with hope deferred. The accumulation of their suffering in all ages *since the crucifixion*, has impressed a character of grief and depression upon this nation, and the tones of sorrow, lamentation, and woe, pervade all their utterances, as a people. Continually expecting their Messiah, yet continually disappointed, they present a living image of despair. Withered, bowed, woe-begone, they evince an inner consciousness which they do not seldom express, that the curse and blight of heaven is upon them. A dispirited, down-cast and mournful air is the very national costume of the Jews. Wherever found, they are marked by this characteristic, and that, too, just in proportion to the degree in which they are imbued with the true spirit and genius of Judaism, and are conscientious in the performances of its rites."

Yes, true it is, that they are wretched and woe-begone—for they invoked "the curse and blight of heaven," when they said, *HIS BLOOD BE ON US AND ON OUR CHILDREN!* And the Savior uttered their doom in the solemn words, "*Behold your house is left unto you desolate!*" And this because, in their worldliness, pride, and unbelief, they "*knew not the time of their visitation.*"

In the exposition of v. 12, we read:—"The reflection at once suggested by these words, is that of the persisting favor with which God regards the seed of Abraham, notwithstanding the apostacy which has accumulated their afflictions upon them. The endearing appellation—'my people'—evinces that they are still his—his in covenant—by an emphasis of interest his."

If this were said of those who are the true children of Abraham, gladly would we respond to it; but in memory of the Savior's words to the unbelieving Jews, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham," we dare not refrain from protesting against applying it to them. "The middle wall of partition" was all that separated the Jews from other nations, and that is "broken down." God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him is accepted of him.

Again, on p. 37, we read, "We are probably not in error,



in supposing that Christians, for the most part, deem the ancient covenant made with Israel as virtually abolished since their rejection of the Messiah, and although not precluded from forgiveness upon acting faith in the Gospel, yet they must come into the fold of Christ, upon precisely the same terms with Gentile believers, casting away all reference to any covenant relations, which may formerly have distinguished their fathers." And then the author, without fixing his eye on the fact that there were two covenants given to Abraham, one temporal, the other eternal, proceeds to repeat again the bestowing of the *everlasting covenant* on the Jews in this world! p. 37. Indeed, everywhere in his Exposition, he seems to labor under the mistaken impression, that the Jews *alone* are called God's people in the Bible, forgetting that God has said that "at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." —Jer. xviii. 9, 10. Jesus said, that "whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my mother and sister and brother."

How sad the thought, that those that are redeemed with the precious blood of the Savior, cannot know God's voice when he speaks to them in the pages of revelation, but deem that all his precious predictions of an everlasting incorruptible inheritance refer to those who are strangers and aliens from the covenant of promise! How sad that they can suppose that Christians are only servants and supernumeraries in the Heavenly Father's family while the *murderers of the Heir*, are "the children," "the people," whom they must lose no time in serving, by making for them "*prophetic prayers!*" May the Lord remove the veil from the hearts of *his people*, his covenant people, "by an emphasis of interest his," when they read the prophets. May they see clearly that the Holy One of Israel, who gave his Son to die for sinners, will, if they receive him, freely give them all things."

In his commentary on the promise, "I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel," p. 38, we find among other remarks the following: "Did our limits permit, we should be much inclined to go into an extended investigation of Isa. xxv. 7—9, with a view to show its entire parallelism with the burden of the present prophecy: 'He will destroy, [Hebrew,

swallow up] in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vale that is spread over all nations. *He will swallow up death in victory*, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from all faces : and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth : for the Lord hath spoken it." The period here referred to, is undoubtedly that of the blissful consummation with which the restoration of Israel is to synchronize, the golden age of the world, to be ushered in by the introduction of the New Jerusalem, as identical with the mountain kingdom, which, after smiting and demolishing the image of all worldly despotisms, is to grow and fill the earth."

If by "the restoration of Israel," the Professor meant the gathering of the redeemed—God's people—to the inheritance promised to the faithful, in the immortal, glorified state, he would just express our view of the passage. But in the closing remarks on this quotation, p. 39, we read, "The intimation is to our minds very obvious, that the removal of the mystic veil from the eyes of the Jews, is the signal of a similar event to other nations,—*for the swallowing up of death is but another form of expressing the same idea*—which shall receive a glorious illumination from the accomplishment of the prophetic destinies of Israel. But upon the proof of this, by a labored exegetical process, we cannot now enter." It is believed some things can be proved without "a labored exegetical process," and it is not *alone* "to the diligent student of the original," (p. 35,) "that concealed links of connexion between different parts of the inspired scriptures are continually disclosing themselves." In the present instance, we would beg leave to save the labor of the exegetical process, by reading a plain portion of God's Word parallel to that under consideration. "Behold, I show you a mystery ; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed : in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump : for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed : for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality ; THEN, [at that time] shall be brought to pass the saying that it is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."—1 Cor. xv. 51—54. We find that saying written in Isa. xxv. 8, which the Professor meditates to summarily dispose of by an "exegetical process." Paul was familiar with it, and also with the context—inspired of God, he applied it to "the abolition of death,"

when "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." Consequently, all the "labored exegesis" of all the "learned," cannot prove that it should be applied to any other event, or period. By glancing at the connexion in which the passage is found, the appropriateness and force of the apostle's application must be seen.

But we refrain from farther hunting down and pursuing *the idea*; for we find the remaining pages occupied with the same "probable means," that will be used by Providence, in restoring the Jews. We acknowledge that the author has faithfully adhered to his "design," as given in the Prefatory Remarks—but we are puzzled as bad as ever with the "Attempted Proof," in the title page: for we cannot find, after diligently searching in all his book, any "proof" of the kind. We can account for this incongruity satisfactorily, only by supposing that in the space afforded between the title of the book and its preface, the author has *jumped* to the desired conclusion; but we frankly confess ourselves unable to perform the same feat.

E. C. C.

---

### ART. XIII.

#### *The Impossibility of the World's Conversion demonstrated, from the Prophetic Destiny, Modern History, Present Attitude, Resources and Intentions of Popery.*

##### POPERY, A SUBJECT OF PROPHECY.

WHETHER it be or be not admitted that Popery is a special subject of prophecy, all must admit that it has had, and must continue to have, while it exists, an important bearing upon all the interests of mankind.

But why should not the Papal organization, in its relations to God, his people, and mankind at large, be a subject of special prophetic attention. Has it not surpassed Egypt in baseness, and atheistic contempt of the high claims of the true God, and the rights of his people? Has it not excelled Tyre in its proud and impious arrogance? Did Syria ever promote one of a thousand of its confederacies, or exhibit a

breath compared with a whirlwind of its fierce anger against the house of David? Did the wild and savage Medo-Persian bear devour flesh, as the ghostly blood-hounds of the Papacy have done? Will it not even compare with Ninevah, the bloody city, all full of lies and robbery as she was? Nay, does not the Papacy belong even to a higher class than these?

What was there in great Babylon, the golden city, with its wide-spread and all-comprehending empire?—in bold, and wise, and invincible Greece, with her unnumbered deities, her refined Corinthian profligacy, her mocking Athenian philosophers?—or even in proud and sturdy Rome, the decree of whose Ceasar imposed a tribute upon all the world, allowing even, that he assumed what the poet has supposed, that

“The world was made for Ceasar!”—

What is there, I ask, in all these great ones of the earth, in which the Papacy has not excelled? And all these are pointed out by Him who ruleth among the nations, through the agency of His servants the prophets! Why, then, should not the Papacy be distinguished by similar attention?

The difficulty and absurdity of supposing that such an organization should not be the subject of prophecy—a *special* subject—are only equalled by the attempt to account for its existence, without supposing a providential interposition for that purpose. And viewed in such a light, it is impossible to conceive why the fate of Popery should have been so unlike to that of a thousand other impositions of fanaticism!

Popery is, it must be, pointed out in the prophecies. Its origin is there—there as the sum of its history and the portrait of its character—and there is the doom that awaits it. It stands forth the most distinguished, as it is the most detestable of all the subjects of prophetic attention. It is brought to view just as angels unveiled the monster outline of proportions, the hideous features and gorgeous drapery of the celestial delineation; just as prophets and apostles gazed upon it in astonishment, while they listened to its blasphemies, surveyed the theatre, and marked the period of its devastations; and just as the church and the world have verified the genuineness of the picture, and illustrated the awful import of that astonishment.

God would have us regard Popery as the grand device, by

which the way for a special mission of infernal malice is prepared among mankind. Its presiding minister is "*The Son of Perdition!*" The subservient body politic, "*ascendeth out of the bottomless pit!*"

He declares it to be the receptacle of all former abominations, the hiding place of all former agencies of notorious evil, and the perfected instrumentality, by which their deadly power upon mankind is chiefly perpetuated. *It is "the habitation of devils! and the hold of EVERY FOUL SPIRIT! and a cage of EVERY UNCLEAN AND HATEFUL BIRD!"*

Over its doom, the redeemed of earth, and the unfallen of heaven, are to join in a strong, harmonious, grateful and joyful requiem:—"And after these things, I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying,

HALLELUIAH!

Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power

Be unto the Lord our God!—

For true and righteous are his judgments.

For he hath judged the great whore

Which did corrupt the earth with her fornication!

And hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hands!

And again they said,—HALLELUIAH!

Popery is the offspring of hell; its doom is hell.—It "*goeth into perdition!*" It is to be "*cast into the lake of fire,*" by "the King of kings and Lord of lords;" and all who have willingly identified themselves with it, "and the devil that deceived them, shall be tormented forever and ever."

These positions in reference to the Papacy, have not originated with us; they are peculiar to no age or portion of the Christian church, but have been cherished at all times, and in all parts of the territory over which she has been scattered, since the power to which they relate has been in a condition to set its seal, by its acts, to the sure word of prophecy.

Even the standard and most unqualified Roman Catholic writers themselves, apply those portions of the prophecies which give the geographical description of the Papacy, to the city of Rome: "Certain it is, that the name Babylon signifies the city of Rome." (Baronius. ad. A. 45.) "John, throughout the Apocalypse, calls Rome Babylon." (Bellarmine, de Rom. Pontif. l. 111. c. 13. Newton.) And no question, which has ever been discussed among Protestants, has probably been decided so unanimously as that of the prophetic designations of Popery. Prof. Gaussen, of Geneva, in a dis-

course before the theological students, at the opening of the course in October, (1843,) speaks as follows :

“ The doctrine, that Rome is the Babylon of which John speaks ; the pope, the Man of Sin, the son of perdition, of whom Paul speaks ; popery, the little horn of which Daniel speaks, I would show you, has been constantly held in the church of God for *more than twelve hundred years*, and has only been lightly esteemed, like the doctrine of an evil Spirit, the Tempter, in times of lax theology and infidelity. ”

When the pious Waldo distributed the Scriptures in France, seven hundred years ago, the cry was soon heard, Come out of Babylon ! When the great Wickliffe preached the Reformation in England, five hundred years ago, all eyes were turned to the Roman pontiff with the exclamation, Behold the Man of Sin ! When the generous Huss, and when Jerome of Prague made their voice heard, a hundred years before Luther, it was against the abominations of “ the great Whore ” foretold by John.

This important doctrine is taught us by three prophets : by Daniel, in chapters ii. vii. and xi. ; by Paul, in his 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians, and his 1st Epistle to Timothy ; and lastly, by John, in chapters ix. xi. xii. xiii. xvii. and xviii. of the Revelation.

Has it not been left to our day alone, and to New England, to produce a reputed evangelical protestant expounder of theology, to declare that

“ The pope and Mahommed, and the French Revolution, and all like matters or persons, are things which have no specific ground or basis in the book of Daniel or of John ! ” \*

Nor is it difficult to account for this fact. The same prophecies which point out the character and distinctions of Popery, have made his position equally notorious. (See 2 Peter ii. and iii.)

He cannot protect himself from the unpleasant and ominous bearing of the prophecies upon his own position, without performing the same service for popery.

#### CHARACTER OF POPERY.

With the deadly character of Popery, the world is but too familiar ; and there are but few who are not of its most infatuated dupes, who would need an argument to prove this our main proposition : — *If Popery is to continue till the end of man's day of grace, that day of grace can never be crowned with the world's conversion !*

---

\* Prof. Stuart, Hints, p. 141.

However, we may here very properly notice, in detail, some of its well-known traits of character. Shall we begin with its *Ambition*? This is the vital principle, the all-pervading and active spirit, the engrossing desire, and the commanding air of Popery,—the high and only purpose for which it appears to value its own existence. It is comprehended and expressed in its name—the *Catholic Church*—which means, *universal*! And if we allow those who adopt the name to be its interpreters, it embraces, practically, more than pertains to our planet. The empire of Beelzebub may fairly be allowed to fall within its jurisdiction; it claims the supremacy, also, in the kingdom of heaven.

To its ambition, every one of its other attributes stand in harmonious subordination, and to this may be traced, so far as anything visible is concerned, all its weaknesses, and all its vices. Its whimsical, arrogant, and blasphemous claims to apostolic parentage, and delegated headship to the church of Christ, the forgeries by which it has maintained its claim upon its "patrimony," its impudent fanaticism, and the boldness of its assumptions, from its earliest to its latest controversies—its stern disregard of all the admitted rights of man, personally or politically—its contempt of all the appointed relations, we might say, even the attributes, of human beings—the demoniac fury of its curses, and its fiend-like cruelty against all whom it has deemed guilty—its diplomatic subtlety and cunning—its undying perseverance and ever-changing policy, may all be ascribed to its ambition!

The earlier manifestations of the ambition of Popery may be illustrated by an exhibition of the same principle in a contest for supremacy, which the writer once witnessed between two children in years, as well as in understanding. The matter in dispute, which furnished the test of superiority, was a *kite*. And pray, where is the difference between the playthings of real children, and those of men who exhibit their folly?—Between a kite and a cardinal's cap—a ball and a bishopric—marbles and mitres? Well, the father of little J. was making him a kite. Little T., of about the same age, between whom and the former the spirit of rivalry had often been called forth, made his appearance as a looker on. Little J. felt his advantage, which he fully expressed in his manner and his words to this effect: "My father is making me a kite! You aint got any kite!" "My father will make me *two* kites!" replied the other. "Your father can't make

such good kites as my father! My kite is *a great large kite!*" "My father will buy me *eleven* kites!" replied little T. That was such a rapid and lofty attainment, in the estimation of little J., that he was nearly at a stand; however, determined not to be outdone, and pausing a little in order to place himself fairly upon the highest position of which he had ever heard or thought, he mastered his dilemma by exclaiming, "I—I—I am God!" His antagonist evidently felt that he was worsted, and either thought it best to grant the claim, or, perhaps, not comprehending the exact import and bearing of the question involved in it, to wave the discussion, and close the contest. Well had it been for the world, if the profane and blasphemous assumptions of Popery had been as harmless.

This feature, however, though always prominent, was not fully developed till the close of the twelfth century. Its position at that time may be seen in the following sketch of the doings of the chief actor in attaining it.

"A. D. 1198. The man at length appeared who was to consummate the ambition of the Popedom. The pontiffs had hitherto been chiefly of obscure birth, and of advanced age, taken from the cloister, and withered by the cloister. Lotharius, Cardinal Deacon, was elected to the papal chair, by the name of Innocent the 3d, in his thirty-seventh year. By descent a man of rank, Count of Segni; celebrated for his knowledge of the canon law, the chief learning of the age; and in the vigor of life, of talent, and the bolder passions, he possessed all the qualities essential to the triumph of kingly ambition. The time was favorable. From the Vatican he saw Europe a dungeon or a desert; Germany convulsed with political faction; France perplexed with religious dispute; Spain sustaining a ruinous and protracted war with the Moor. England wasted by ancient feuds, and about to plunge her remaining vigor into civil and ecclesiastical struggle, that bitter travail from which, in a remoter age, her faith and freedom were to be born. In the whole circle of Europe neither sagacity nor strength were visible to resist the young and daring monarch who domineered over it from its sacred central throne. The Roman polity already spoke the haughtiest language of power. "*The pope is the lord of the world*"; neither prince nor bishop, neither civil nor ecclesiastical ruler, can have any lawful authority in church or state, underived from him." The successful activity with which this more than conqueror pursued his career may be seen from a slight detail of his principal transactions in nearly the order in which they occurred.

His first act was the total subjection of the city of Rome to the papal See. The prefect and magistrates had hitherto taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor of Germany. This he instantly abolished, and transferred their allegiance to himself.

*He now commenced the exercise of his power over sovereigns.* He excommunicated Alphonsus king of Galicia and Leon, for marrying within the prohibited degrees.

He compelled, by the threat of excommunication, Sanctius king of Portugal to renew his tribute to Rome.



He laid the foundations of the Inquisition, by sending commissioners to France, superseding the authority of the bishops in matters of heresy.

He invested Constantia, the widow of the emperor of Germany, and her son, with the kingdom of Sicily.

He declared and supported a new candidate for the empire, thus giving rise to a furious war which lasted till 1207.

He laid France under an interdict for its monarch's rejection of his queen. By this most formidable infliction to a superstitious age, the king was compelled to submission.

He reunited Bulgaria and Wallachia to his See. He threatened the king of Hungary with excommunication, and reduced him to obedience.

He crowned Peter king of Arragon, demanding of him an oath to be "faithful and obedient to his lord, Pope Innocent III.," and obtaining a yearly tribute.

He received the submission of the Patriarch of Constantinople; subsequently declared his election null; and finally confirmed it, consecrating him.

He excommunicated the Venetians.

He confirmed the German imperial crown to Philip, whom he had before excommunicated. The excommunication was taken off only at the entreaty of a deputation from the bishops of Germany.

In 1203, Innocent raised the war of persecution against the Albigenses in the south of France, absolving the subjects of the Count of Thoulouse from their oath of allegiance.

In 1208 the celebrated transaction occurred, which showed England that she was neither too remote nor too powerful to be safe from the Roman sceptre. King John's refusal to receive Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury on the Pope's nomination, had roused the wrath of the Vatican. England was laid under an interdict. By this act, which may well excite our astonishment at the temper of the times in which it could have been inflicted, or been borne, the whole kingdom was instantly put out of the pale of Christianity. The churches were closed, the dead were buried in the highways, and without any funeral solemnity; the sacrament was prohibited; of all the rites, baptism alone remained. A more personal blow was then levelled at the king, in his excommunication, and the nullity of the oath of allegiance. A third, and, if possible, still more extraordinary assumption of power, was the declaration that the English throne was vacant, and that it was given to the French king. The result is too familiar to be repeated. The haughtiness of the papal legate, the guilty pusillanimity of John, and the bitter and contemptuous wrath of the nation at seeing the crown profaned by the foot of an Italian priest, have been engraved in records more imperishable than brass or marble, have been burnt in on the memory of England by the indignant and immortal fires of poetry.

His daring and turbulent life had now approached its end. His last act was worthy to crown his successors. In 1215, he convened the fourth Lateran Council; the most pompous assemblage ever gathered under the auspices of Rome, a convocation of the ecclesiastical world. At it were present the two Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem; the deputies of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; four hundred and twelve Bishops; and ambassadors from all the Christian kings. *It was the declared submission of Christendom, East and West; the civilized earth at the footstool of the Popedom.* At this council, the tenets of Popery, hitherto growing up in silence or shapelessness, were collected, formed, and promulga-

ted, as the eternal law of Rome. Innocent had the ominous distinction of setting the seal to transubstantiation—auricular confession—the right of deposing kings—the subjection of all ecclesiastical powers—and the Papal supremacy, spiritual and temporal, over all Christians, all ranks of authority and ALL MANKIND.” [Croly on Apoc., pp. 247—250.]

And let no one suppose its ambition has changed, with the change in its condition. The unvarying tone of all the dignitaries and emissaries of Popery, is expressed in the following remark of Count Montalembert, who has been hailed by the Papal press as “the O’Connell of France,” (and thus unguardedly, in a moment of exultation, letting out the *truth* of their many public denials, that “Repeal was a *Catholic* question,”) in his speech in behalf of Popery, a few months since, in the French Chamber of Peers:

“Now there are two things equally demonstrated by the history of eighteen centuries; [the time here, is a *Catholic oversight*,] the first is that the Church has never refused its efficacious, loyal, and sincere support, to the power which called for it; or which simply tolerated it, whatsoever might be the origin of the nature of that power. The second is, that the Church has never sacrificed to any power, whatever might be its origin or its nature, the sovereign independence of its teaching, and of its authority, which constitutes its universal character and eternal fruitfulness.”

“Support!” “To the powers which have called for” the support of Popery, it has ever been like the “support” of consumption as a relief from fever, differing from it, however, in this, consumption is *not* certain damnation, as it is certain death. And it has been as “sincere” as the regard of the gambler for his victim; and as “loyal” as that of the banditti, who are determined, if they cannot reign and rob by law, that they will ruin and riot in spite of law.

#### ITS FANATICISM.

Only secondary to the ambition of Popery, and at the same time the most essential qualification for the attainment of the objects of that first trait, is its fanaticism! We do not now refer to any one of the familiar forms of that derangement of our religious nature, which has produced, in every age, and never more than in our own, so many strange specimens of religious character—holy liars—holy thieves—holy fornicators—holy worldlings—holy persecutors—holy whim-worshippers and spiritual harlequins, whose mission is characterized by exhibitions as fantastical as if they should attempt to see with their fingers or toes, eat with their eyes or ears, or walk on their heads; though Popery is the hot-bed of all such productions. Indeed, every one of these “is a Pope

in himself!" But we refer to that plenitude of fanaticism, on the strength of which Popery plants itself, at a single bound, in a position above which there is no other to whom its opponents are allowed to appeal,—*the fanaticism of infallibility*. And although this has made Popery the laughing-stock of the world, by the ridiculous freaks to which it has given rise at all periods of its history, it is still cherished with as much gravity, as the ragged and bare-headed idiot, in the street, whips himself, tosses his head, trots, runs, stops and kicks, in the full conceit that he is *a very fine horse*.

We are aware, as every one of the least reflection and sense must be, that at this age of the world, this notable trait of the Papacy is a serious drawback to its respectability; but pray how could its position be maintained without it? How could the world be assured that Peter ever saw Rome, much more, that the apostle ever sat in the chair of his *successor*? If that foundation stone is overturned, the whole superstructure is levelled to the dust. It might appear, even now, that the Pope is the successor of Peter when instigated by "*Satan*," or when he "denied his Master," and not of *Saint Peter*—the apostle. And if he is not the *apostolic* successor of Peter, he is not "*the head of the church*,"—"God's vicegerent on earth!" And so we must be deprived of the lesson, which we are compelled to admit may be intended, if we *grant* the claims of Popery,—that Christ means to exhibit in his "vicar" the opposite of what he did himself, in order to show us the difference between the head of the church *resisting* the devil, and the head of the church *worshipping* the devil, for the sake of "the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them."

How are the millions, in the communion of the "only true church," to be satisfied that their salvation is secured, because they receive the sacraments from *apostolic* hands? or that the "sacred relics" which they worship—the hundred heads of one saint—the thousand legs, fingers and toes of another,—the tons of the "holy virgin's hair," and the cart-loads of wood, "fragments of the true cross,"—that all these were once the genuine parts and appendages of the holy beings and things which they are now *known* to be? And how could the world rest assured and contented as it does, that the numberless questions in which have been involved all the dearest interests of human beings—physical, moral, intellect-

ual, personal, political, temporal, and eternal,—questions which have shaken the world—turned peaceful kingdoms into battle fields—converted churches and altars, dwellings and granaries into a vast funeral pile, on which must be offered the purest and holiest portions of the church of God, and whole communities of peaceful and happy beings—armed and inspired parents and children, brothers and friends, to become the butchers of each other—and torn asunder, as sheep are torn by wolves and tigers, all the moral ligaments and fibres which enter into the multiplied relations that men sustain to each other,—how is it to be known that all these questions have been decided exactly according to the will of God? All must be settled, if settled at all, by the impudent and blasphemous fanaticism of infallibility. And so, “the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God,” impiously dares to decide them!

#### ITS AVARICE.

Next to the ambition, and fanaticism of Popery, while it is also a prime motive and important means for the promotion of both, is its avarice. “Silver and gold have I none,” said Peter to the lame man. “Look out for the silver and gold,”—“gain is godliness,” says the Pope, at least practically.

“Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; *not for filthy lucre*, but of a ready mind,” says Peter the apostle.—Look out for the flock, *oversee* the flock, fleece the flock, says the “*successor*” of Peter. And thus all who are *in* the fold of “the only true church” are prized, and all who are *out* of that fold are desired, in proportion to their ability to add to the golden fleece, for the benefit of those who give the best proof in the world that they *care for the flock*. And while the example of Peter and the command of Peter are a standing reproof of the church of which it is *infallibly* said that Peter was “the first Bishop,” it appears to have been assigned to Peter also, in his words to Simon Magus, to pronounce her doom, “*Thy money perish with thee!*”

Births, baptisms, weddings, burials, tithes, confessions, masses, saints’ days, the exhibition of wax, plaster, or paper saints and babies, by hypocritical monks and friars; the sale

of indulgences for robbery, perjury, adultery, prostitution, &c. &c., have been, and still are, the standing and lawful resources of the officials, favorites, and supporters of the Papacy; while legacies, obtained perhaps by perjury or fraud; the confiscation of estates, that were determined to belong to *heretics*, simply because "the church" desired them herself; and the sale of kingdoms, have been, if they are not now, to the same extent, and in the same manner, the occasional and more productive harvests from which it has enriched itself.

Time would fail us to speak in detail of the hatred of Popery to the Bible; of the idolatry which it enjoins, and by which it thrives; of its hypocrisy, ignorance, treachery, fawning sycophancy and merciless cruelty; sensuality, bigotry and blasphemy.—Though each of these are essential attributes and parts of this monster of monsters, and indispensable to the harmony of its horrible proportions, and the perfection of its matchless abominations.

We may, however, afford a more particular notice of

#### PAPAL IGNORANCE.

It is the office of true science to make man acquainted with the various objects and beings to which he stands related, as it is the office of true philosophy to make him acquainted with their nature, their relations to each other, and the bearing of each upon himself, with the mode by which he is to derive from them the enjoyment they are intended to impart. And God has adapted the various faculties and susceptibilities of man's nature to these objects and beings with such nice precision, that one of his powers can never be made to perform the office of another, without producing something unnatural, however wonderful it may appear; and the objects which are intended for one of his faculties can never be displaced or exchanged for other objects without leaving his entire nature in a restless and debased condition. God has made provision for the whole circle of his faculties and appetites; education, in the widest sense, if it be worthy of the name, directs each member of the circle to its appropriate provision. When this development of man's nature is properly effected, order, harmony, rest, is the result. The individual has obtained the highest enjoyment, of which, under present circumstances, he is capable.

Now it is one of the unalterable laws of this wise arrange-

ment, that our higher faculties must be brought to enjoy the provision to which they are adapted, or they will continually be lifting some inferior thing into its place, and with everything inferior they must remain forever unsatisfied. So that the grand and indispensable condition, on which the entire well-being of man depends, and for which no substitute can be contrived, is, that he be brought into favor and communion with God. This done, and the appointed regulator, which affects for good the whole machinery of man's nature, is introduced ; without it, all is disorder—all out of place. And this can be effected only by the Spirit of God himself, through the mediation of Jesus Christ.

It is true, also, that the connection between science in general, and revealed religion, to the intellect, is similar to that between the enjoyment of God and the enjoyment of other things, to the heart.—As all our temporal and worldly enjoyments are calculated and designed to lead us to God, by their insufficiency to meet the wants of our higher nature, and the enjoyment of God is not only more pure and more solid than that derived from any other source, but also heightens every other enjoyment, so every department of science proclaims a necessity for the lessons and provisions of revealed religion, in order to bring man into a condition to harmonize with that of other forms of existence, wherever these lessons are wanting, and every department of science testifies also to their value wherever they are possessed.

To refer the reader to a single case for proof and illustration, let him compare for a moment, pagan Scotland, as indicated by the sublime, though superstitious ravings of Ossian, with Scotland as it is, under the influences which have given to the world such productions as the "Philosophy of Religion," "Philosophy of a Future State," &c., &c., &c.

The higher enjoyment, while it is a life-giving charm in itself, diffuses its sweetness into every inferior enjoyment ; so the light of divine truth, like the sun in itself to our otherwise dark universe, gives a new and higher value to all other truth, and enables man to place himself in his proper and intended position, and thus joyfully and honorably, and to the glory of his Maker and Redeemer, fulfil the high, and wise, and beneficent purpose of his existence.

The study and practical observance of these wise and evident arrangements and plans of heaven, is "wisdom,"—intelligence—of the true stamp ; whatever is opposed to their study and observance, is folly—*ignorance* !

And this ignorance, in its darkest form, is an absolute element, an essential part and ever present appendage of Popery. Its fundamental dogma is a fiction, and it has surrounded itself with a thousand other fictions in order to disguise its fundamental one. Every Roman Catholic, inasmuch as he is under the true papal spirit, lives in a world of falsehood. Its only tendency is to darken the intellect and debase the heart. Popery could not take a step, it could not exist, but in this its appropriate element, ignorance.

It cannot be said of Popery that it is productive or promotive of some forms of true knowledge, while it may be deficient in some of its other forms. It naturally and necessarily puts out the light of truth in all its forms. It may boast of wisdom, of men of genius and skill in the arts and sciences. But its wisdom is like that recognized among the Jews: (and there are good reasons for believing that Popery is the device of Jewish malignity and infernal ingenuity against the pure religion of Jesus Christ,) "it is wise to do evil, but to do good it has no knowledge!" It makes the very name of wisdom an abhorrence by perverting, what may be possessed of it, in order to defeat and oppose all its true purposes. The more perfect the skill which sustains such a system of corruption, the more disgusting is the exhibition of ignorance which it furnishes.—And their men of genius, many of them, were under the necessity of not existing or of being "Catholics"—they must be "Catholics," or they must die: all of them became what they were, not on account of Popery, but in spite of it; and their names and works, if they survive, only mock the unconscious stupidity around them, while they serve to ornament the altars of the tyrant to whom they must pay their unwilling homage, and to give an interest to the heartless mummeries which are poured forth from the multitudes who frequent them.

The gross and unqualified ignorance of Popery consists in substituting fancies for facts, or in deranging the natural and appointed relations of things, and attempting to adjust them to each other on a new, false, unnatural, and monstrous scale, which completely turns the divine arrangement, as far as possible, upside down. It is perpetually exalting some fiction, or merely temporary circumstance, into the place of that which is an absolute and essential truth, while that which is essential is lost sight of entirely, or recognized only as policy may dictate, in order to make the cheat more effectual.—

The ignorance which has laid the foundation, has impressed itself upon every section of the superstructure—a dazzling and bewildering, and, to all but those who know and love the truth, fatal display of “lying wonders !”

Thus it stands forth in its *infallibility*, never yielding “the independence of its authority or of its teaching ;” they are above the fixed arrangements of the Great Creator, above his word, above the reason of man. And all this is necessary, or there must be an end to “its eternal fruitfulness ;” and since it is so, it is proper that Popery should be the “patron saint” of ignorance.

By shutting out, or preventing the attainment of the great first truth, confusion and darkness is thrown over all other truth ; and the attainment of all other truth is dreaded lest it should lead to a right perception and observance of the first truth. Ignorance of both is essential to the existence of the Papal machinery. The means of grace are degraded by making their efficacy depend upon the administrator, or perverted by turning the channels of mercy into the price of mercy. And the darkness which blinds the “Catholic” mind upon his relation to God, renders it necessary that he should be an artful and cruel, or designing bigot in his intercourse with his fellow-men. Unless his better nature, or the grace of God, gives him the mastery of his creed, it is a social as well as personal curse. They speak with apparent affection of their “*Protestant brethren*” and lay claim to their charity, while all the world knows that a true “Catholic” believes that “there is no salvation out of the Church of Rome.”—The Protestant churches—ministry—marriages—baptisms, are all unchristian ; and a thousand proofs and illustrations of the hatred and treachery of “the Church” assures us that she only wants the opportunity and ability to annihilate every human being, who would dare to protest against the claims of her remorseless ambition, from the face of the earth.

Truly interpreted, so as to accord with this caricature of all that is sacred, the gilding upon her church crosses would be emblematic of her hypocrisy, as their erect head would be of her impudence—their extended arms would speak of her all-comprehending ambition—the openings in the towers which support them, would express, symbolically, that she stands upon a cloven foot—the dark vaults beneath her churches would indicate her sympathy with the bottomless pit, and the avenues which lead to them, that her doors are the portals of hell.



When it speaks, it "opens its mouth in blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." It is never present but by "the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." It calls superstition faith\*—idolatry worship—devotion to the interests of its presiding lord, is religious integrity,—the most abject servility in whatever his caprice may appoint, is submission to God—to wish and labor for the subjection of "the Christian world† to the Church of Rome," is patriotism; and to honor the false obligations of this counterfeit Christianity, all the ties of natural affection, all the bonds of friendship, gratitude or justice, must be violated at its bidding, on the pain of its wrath and curse even to eternal damnation.

#### PAPAL TESTIMONY OF PAPAL IGNORANCE.

In support of the grave charge of ignorance here made against Popery, it may be demanded that we present some proof. And this is so abundant that we are more perplexed with its "fruitfulness," than its scarcity. Its own testimony is, of course, infallible. We shall not rest the charge upon the old and well-known papal maxim: "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," a compendious confession that its devotions are founded in ignorance; but shall endeavor to present the truth under several heads.

1. The strength and glory of Popery began to depart with the passing away of the dark ages. The inventions and agents which introduced the Reformation, were, to the whole multitude of hideous creatures which Popery had called into existence, what the ushering in of day is to the birds and reptiles who make night their holiday, and to the feline tribes for whose depredations the period of darkness is the only fitting opportunity—putting an end to the songs and carousals of the one, and giving to the prey of the other a season of repose. From that time to the present, the complaints of all

---

\* "What is faith?" inquires Voltaire. And he replies, "faith is folly!" Voltaire was familiar with no other religious faith but that of Popery. And who can be surprised that any man of sense should come to the conclusion, that if Popery is divine, it is better to be an infidel?

† "If the Church of Rome, when she maintains that out of her pale there is no salvation, and that she alone has the power of governing the Christian world, is not infallibly right, then she is infallibly wrong." [Montalembert's Letter to the Camden Society.]

the true officials and all the true worshippers of "the only true Church," have been heard, like the occasional hooting of the owl in the darkened forest, solitary den or ruin, or like the growl of the hungry wolf or tiger on the confines of civilization, impatient for the return of night. Though it is sometimes difficult to tell whether these sounds are ominous of approaching darkness, or proofs that their forest shades, dens, and jungles have been disturbed by Christian enterprise.

But our proofs must be brief. On this point we give the testimony of the "Catholics" of Paris—the meagre procession who greeted the "Compte Montalembert" with their congratulations for the part he had taken in behalf of "the Church."

In no country has Popery had a fairer field than in France; they must know whereof they affirm. And they declare, in sorrow, that "the strength and glory of the Church has been declining for *three hundred years*." They point us exactly to the chronological boundary for the termination of the dark ages.

2. "Catholic" ignorance and consequent inferiority is felt, as confessed by themselves, when brought into contact with Protestant intelligence. Every one who has visited a community of "Catholics," whose circumstances, in every thing but religion, may be equal if not superior to those of their Protestant neighbors, has been struck with the difference in the general intelligence and thrift of the two classes. The difference seen in passing from one to the other, is like that between the darkness and sterility of an arctic winter, and the sunshine, fertility and beauty of a tropical spring. The idol to which the "Catholic" bows down, under the most ordinary circumstances, is as unproductive of intelligence and comfort, as one of their own "pillar saints," and often robs them of their reason and their resources at once, inflicting a blight both upon the faculties which God has given them, and upon the ample fields which he has provided for their healthy and happy development. But let them speak for themselves. We cut the following from the papal "Pilot," of September 14th:—

"It is charged upon the Church that she prefers ignorance to knowledge in her votaries, because, as her opponents say, she can use the former for almost any purposes of intrigue and ambition. As Catholics, it becomes

us to remove all false impressions against us, which we can do without too far listening to their advocates, and as this is one of the most commonly asserted and most generally believed, we cannot do better than consider how to overthrow it. It is vain to deny it; it is more so to retort; neither solemn assertion, nor recrimination, nor historic evidence, will silence those who believe this falsehood, they must see and feel to the contrary.—We can show that it is unfounded by *seeking after education, and in no other way.*”

Certainly they “cannot do better,” but does that prove the “falsehood” upon us, or the *fact* we charge upon “the Church?” Again:—

“Much vilified as we are in both these capacities, [Catholics and Irishmen,] America admits us amongst her citizens, as freely as she does the most favored sons of fortune and education. We owe to her, then, before God and the world, to repay her liberality by *gaining* knowledge, for her sake, as well as for our own, since, assuredly, without self-instruction, and self-culture, there can be no real, individual independence, consequently, no correct self-government.”

Other organs of “the Church,” speak in similar terms where the same circumstances make it necessary.

“But our countrymen in the United States are peculiarly bound to engage in this project, [of education,] with spirit and energy. There education, though often trivial, is extensively diffused. In the intercourse of an educated and an uneducated people, assumption upon one side, and humiliation on the other, are inevitably necessary. This seems almost like a law of our weakness, such is its universality of action; and the United States are not a place that admits of exceptions. Then we defy the very best disposed to resist the impression of inferiority made by masses, who are ignorant, however splendidly virtuous.”—*Halifax Register.*

The discovery has also been made in Ireland, and a new spirit is aroused. We have room only for a brief sentence:—

“The months and years of the coming agitation will be heroically spent—spent in never-ceasing efforts after knowledge, virtue, and religion.”

It has given rise to this new piece of catechism:—

“Why is English grain more valuable in the market than Irish?”

Because our farmers are less clean and careful than the English.

Why is learning more diffused in Scotland than in Ireland?

Because, in Scotland, ignorance is more contemptible, and parents more desirous and more careful to give their children the benefits of education.”

*Newry Examiner.*

We must add, What makes “parents more careful to give their children the benefits of education,” in Scotland than in Ireland? Answer, *Protestantism!*

These illustrations and confessions might be extended to

any length, as they are found in every country where Popery has had opportunity to bring forth its own fruit, at every period since the beginning of its history, all the references to the literature, science and arts of the monastics and Jesuit missionaries, by "the Church," to the contrary, notwithstanding. Protestantism has done more for the general diffusion, even of what the monks did preserve or invent, in fifty years, than Popery has done for centuries.

3. The vital ignorance of Popery appears from the fact, that men of ordinary sense, on questions of a general character, appear like "mistaken fools," to use the words of Montalembert, where Popery is involved. We can give but a few specimens, and we prefer that these should be modern. Let us hear the French "nobleman, who promises to become a pillar of truth in France, and a formidable champion of the Church," and styles himself "her soldier." In pointing out the inconsistencies of the Puseyites, "as a man who knows the value of truth and the value of a soul," he says :

"If St. Dunstan and St. Anselm, St. Lanfranc, St. Thomas of Canterbury, or archbishop Chichely, could be called out of their tombs to resume their crosiers in any English cathedral, their horror would be great at seeing *married priests reading English prayers in those desecrated edifices*. But assuredly their horror would be much greater still, if they were to find beneath copes like their own, and at the foot of altars like theirs, and rood lofts with crucifixes, and every other exterior identity, these same *married priests*, carrying in their hearts the spirit of schism, glorying in the revolt of their forefathers, and pledged by *insular pride* to insult and deny that infallible see of St. Peter, from which all those great saints had humbly solicited the pallium, and for whose sacred rights they so nobly fought."—[Montalembert's letter to the Camden Society.]

And "if" St. Peter and St. Paul could be called out of their graves to visit "that infallible see," not "to resume their crosiers," but to introduce to "his holiness," the personage whose vicar he pretends to be ; what a scene it must furnish. Having passed the "Swiss mercenaries and Austrian soldiers," and found their way to the Pontifical palace, Peter proceeds :—Brother Gregory, I am a stranger at Rome, but Brother Paul, here at my right, tells me that the condition of the gospel and its apostles must have changed very much since he first appeared here as the defender of "the sect every where spoken against." We tried to find the "hired house" in which he used to "preach the kingdom of God, and the things concerning our Lord Jesus Christ ;" and were a little

puzzled to learn that an apostle had taken up his residence in "the palace." However, as you have the reputation of being my successor, I may remind you that it will be the more necessary for you to observe the directions I left for the elders : Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly : not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind ; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.

But I am forgetting. We called to visit you, in company with "the Chief Shepherd," here upon my left. You remember he restored my wife's moth—

"Oh, horror!" exclaims the "soldier of the Church," who is in attendance at the "infallible see." "In the name of St. Dunstan, and all the monkish saints in the calender ; the church cannot fellowship *married* priests, only as a *degrading* exception!"

"What meaneth this?" says Paul. "Is it possible that here among the saints at Rome, whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world, I see the fulfillment of my own prediction, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils ; speaking lies in hypocrisy ; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron ; *forbidding to marry*? Is the doctrine here denied that "marriage is honorable *in all*?" that "a bishop must be blameless, the husband of *one wife*?"

Gregory. "You are indeed *strangers* at Rome. I do not acknowledge you as bishops of the true church. You are scismatics—rebels—heretics!"

Paul. "Am I not an apostle? If I be not an apostle to others, yet doubtless I am to you! Mine answer to them that do examine me is this:—Have we not power to lead about a sister, *a wife*, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?"—1 Cor. ix. 1—5.

Montalembert. "Shall these men, forsooth, be acknowledged by us as our brethren, or as our spiritual fathers? Shall the perpetrators and inheritors of these unexpiated, unrepented, unforgiven sins, come in quietly and sit down among the Catholics, and shall we not one and all arise to reject and expel them? God forbid that we should do otherwise! There is a place in the Catholic Church for public penitents, whence many saints have risen on the wings of humility and contrition, to the glorious eminence of an Augustine : but there is no place for proud sinners, who would contend for isolated error, without confessing their guilt."—(Letter.)

Peter. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word,

that ye may grow thereby : if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious : to whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God and precious, we also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, *an holy priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious : and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded : but a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble *at the word*, being disobedient : whereunto also they were appointed. This is the stone which is set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other : for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. In the sight of God speak we in Christ."

*The Lord Jesus. (To Peter.)* "Thou art Peter. And upon *this rock* will I build *my Church*, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I Jesus have sent mine angels to testify these things in the churches. For I testify unto every one that heareth their words, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written therein. And if any man shall take away from their words, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written therein. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him : the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

*Montalembert. (To the Strangers.)* "We are not called upon to carry on a controversy with each other. The ground on which we stand is unequal, and the odds between us would be uneven. To convert you, as well as all heretics, is and must be my desire, but not my province." "But taught by conscience and authority to look upon these doctrines as the most awful forms of sin and pride that have ever appeared in the world, I pronounce you to be in that state of *invincible ignorance*, which is the only reason which the Church admits for not belonging to her. One thing quite certain is, that individuals or churches cannot be both Catholic and Protestant ; they must choose between one and the other.

In conclusion, let me beg your acceptance of papers, that will show you how the torrent of grace is flowing among *Romanists*, and what are the fruits of *Mariolatry*. May that Blessed Lady, who has been so long the object of the jeers and blasphemies of Protestants—may she use her *omnipotentia supplex* to enlighten, to bless, and to console you."—(*Letter.*)

Excommunicated from "the church," by "her soldier," the strangers retire. We have done no injustice to the "Compte." It is but a fair exhibition of "that invincible ignorance," which every "Catholic" betrays, where Popery is involved.

To this interesting specimen furnished by the "soldier" of "the Church," we must refer to a more interesting one among

#### HER "PHILOSOPHERS,"—

Mr. O. A. Brownson, a recent convert. In his "Review" for October, 1844, he delivers himself of this masterly imitation of "his holiness":—

"Believing, as we do, that the Church of Christ, [the Papacy] is infallible, and authoritative because infallible, we have no sympathy with those who seek to restrain its authority as a body politic. It is a kingdom supreme and complete in itself, established and endowed by Christ, its Founder and invisible Governor, *for the express purpose of governing mankind*. All attempts to control it, to restrain its free action, or to bring it into subjection to any authority foreign to itself, we look upon *as treason against the Eternal King*, and as a betrayal of the true interests of man and society. Let civil governors and temporal princes learn this, and cease from their *insane warfare against the Lord and his Anointed*. It was the mad ambition of European princes, seeking to make the Church their tool, that fostered the spirit which effected *the Protestant schism*, which, however much its children may sing its praises, has already proved a serious calamity, and will yet be looked upon as the *severest curse* that could have befallen the nations involved in its guilt. We shrink not from the abused name of Papist; and we only regret that the ambition and wickedness of civil rulers have been able to *prevent the papacy from doing all the good it has attempted*."

This is sufficient to prove both the genuineness of *the conversion*, and the truth of the proposition before us. But is it not surprising, that a philosopher should not be able to discern, that whatever the Church of Christ was endowed with by Christ, its Founder and invisible Governor, his Church was not committed to the care of men who were

"Partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,  
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, and lust!"—

that his Church never expected "a kingdom supreme and complete in itself," till their Nobleman returned from the far country, after having received for himself a kingdom, but that, until that event, they were to be pilgrims and strangers on the earth, neither looking to Rome, Mecca, old Jerusalem, nor Nauvoo, for a visible king or city, but seeking one *to come?*

There is this difference between "the papacy," and "the Church of Christ?" The pastors of the former are false apostles—grievous wolves, not sparing the flock—lords over God's heritage; those of the latter feed the flock from love to the Chief Shepherd, and are gentle towards them, even as a nurse towards her children. The members of the Church of Christ are so, because they have his spirit and keep his commandments; those who are in the communion of "the papacy," are so, because they submit to the "presto change" of these false apostles, and make void the law of God through her traditions.

We know the fallacies by which Mr. B. maintains his posi-

tion, but these only add richer traits to the specimen, and to the proof of our declaration.—First, certain promises were given to the Church, by Christ, which *must* make her infallible, he tells us.

Secondly, “the Church of Rome” is the infallible Church, because she is the true Church. Thirdly, she is the true Church, because St. Peter, who received primary apostolic powers, was her first bishop, &c. Fourthly, St. Peter was her first bishop because the true and infallible church declares that to be a fact. And when you demand the proof that Peter ever saw Rome—that he was endowed with distinct powers from the other apostles, or, that if he were, how these could be secured to any one who might assume to be his successor, though he should deny both Peter and his Master, you must receive, in proof of all this, the *ipse dixit* of the infallible church.

And, granting the claim for the moment, if Mr. B. should explain to us the depository in which this infallibility is lodged—whether it is in the Pope, a council, the priesthood, the membership, the whole together, or any combination of them—and when the infallible church was the most infallible, when she condemned Galileo to prison as a heretic, or when she endorsed his heresy in the productions of Dr. Wiseman and our philosopher; when she denounces liberty as “a pestilent heresy,” at Rome, or extols it as the glory of “the church” in France and our own land; when she declared her edition of the Bible, printed by order of Pope Sixtus, should “forever remain in force, (*perpetuo valituram constitutionem*,)” or when she ordered that to be replaced by the edition of Pope Clement,—if he should explain all this, to add no more, the specimen would be found equal, without a doubt, to the “learned ignorance” of the “angelical doctors” of the dark ages.

Well, perhaps it was intended by Providence that it should be, under the Christian dispensation as under the Jewish, that those who were conscious of sustaining no other relation to God or to His Son, than that which might be traced out by the way of Abraham, “Paul or Apollos or Cephas,” i. e. *Peter*, should be left to be wise above what is written: and so “professing themselves to be wise, become fools.” Those who sustain the true relation have no need of it. “Henceforth know we no man after the flesh!”

We can hardly return from this digression, without sug-



gesting that the philosopher of the church needs to beware, lest his connection with this pliant "tool" of "ambition" should prove dangerous to his humility; and that "her soldier" is worthy to be entrusted with the superintendence of the second part of the tragedy of "*St. Bartholomew's eve!*"

4. Popery confesses its ignorance by resorting to violence in defending its faith and practices, which should be defended, if they can be, only by truth, by argument, by example. It dare not trust the multitudes, whom it has enslaved and debased, to intermingle with Christians of ordinary intelligence; it must therefore lay an embargo upon those in its own dominions, and thus confess their ignorance by showing its dread of the light. At this day, travellers are forbidden to take their Bibles and some other books for private use, into the dominions of Popery, as the following fact will show.

"A circular has been issued of the 18th of August, in reference to copies of the Scriptures and other books, under the authority of which, even the English Bibles of English gentlemen and families travelling through Sardinia, have been seized and taken from them."

The following is a copy of the receipt, given to an English gentleman and his daughter, who, on entering Sardinia, had their Bible, &c. taken from them, which they insisted upon as security that their property should be returned.

"The 18th of September, have been retained at the Dogara of St. Remo, a Bible and a prayer book in the English language.

NEANI VEDIT.

Circular of the Directory of Turin, 18th of August, 1844."—*Cheever's Letters.*

And the world knows the opposition to education, which the emissaries of the Pope have manifested, out of his dominions—in our own country and France in particular; while it is well known that in cases where they affect to be in favor of education, it is only a stratagem, to be prosecuted until the efforts of Protestantism are defeated, if possible; and in despair of that, why, they at last make an effort to secure something that will pass for a general education on a "Catholic" system. "The Pilot," of Nov. 30, in giving the outline of a plan for "emigrant education," says:—

"The institute should not be confined to emigrants alone. Young men born and brought up in the city—in the faith of the Catholic Church—might find therein, instruction and entertainment, which would, perhaps, preserve them from dissipation and apostasy."

The same paper contains the following from the *Diario di Roma* :—

“ The Abbe de Cazales, formerly professor of French literature in the University of Louvain, read a very remarkable dissertation at the sitting of the *Academy of the Catholic Religion* held on the 5th ult. The subject proposed was the question in Moral Philosophy—What are the advantages of a religious education among the poor classes of society ? The author, in the first place, proceeded to show that in almost the whole of Europe, the industrial classes are daily becoming more wretched and more corrupt ; that in order to remedy this appalling evil, some political economists have recommended the extension of instruction among those classes, but that the results have not answered the hopes which they had entertained, because that instruction was not generally accompanied by a moral and religious education ; and from these general considerations, the learned abbe descended to particular details, and arrived at the *wise conclusion*, that in order effectually to remedy the increasing depravity of so considerable a portion of the human race, it was necessary to apply one’s self with zeal to the development of a Christian and Catholic education among them. The dissertation was received with the strongest marks of approbation by the select auditory before whom it was read.”

But then, it is hardly possible for the “ Catholics ” to become familiar even with their own corrupt scriptures, and falsified histories, without seeing the character of the Papacy in so clear a light as to lead to “ apostasy ” from her communion. But even this is too much to expect, as her “ existence is based on the people’s ignorance.”

#### PORTRAIT OF POPERY.

If I were to attempt an emblematic moral portrait of Popery, in order to express the familiar paradoxical traits in its character, I should combine in one group, several forms of existence, naturally the most unlike to each other ; and to show the harmony of its traits, these forms of existence should stand in the following fixed relation to each other.

To express the amazing stupidity which encourages and appoints the use of such a cheat, by a creature of God, before whom there is presented an eternity of immortal blessedness to be lost or won, to barter all for the perishable honors and gains of this world, which cannot fully bless us, even for a moment, would require that the principal figure in the group, (though it would be a positive impeachment of the poor beast to do it,) should be a jackass.

The mock gravity with which the whole papal service is performed, with a design to mock God and deceive the sim-

ple, must be expressed by an ape in canonicals mounted upon the ass.

The monstrous and irrational perversion of divine things, the violation of all propriety, and contempt of all natural order, which gives to Popery its loathsome and abominable character, could be expressed only by putting an archangel in the most absolute subjection to the ape, to whose silly and capricious habits, and also to those of the groveling ass, he should be compelled to accommodate himself.

To express the essential depravity and unmatched practical wickedness of the papal system, as a whole, the stupid brute, the silly and contemptible ape, and the celestial captive should be placed under the most absolute control of the most ingenious and malicious fiend of hell, who should monopolize the benefits of the system, keep the whole a going in his order, by assigning to the angel perpetual drudgery, and while he should also appoint the ape and the ass their work, grant them an occasional holiday.

The fiend should be provided with masks and suits to correspond—to be used in dressing the ape for any and every possible call of circumstances—and also with a barbed spear to strike and hold the victim that dared to dream of “rebellion against the Lord.”

The ape should be provided with a crook in one hand, and a budget of brimstone in the other,—the first to secure sinners who are more anxious to quiet their consciences with their money, than by submitting to God; the last for the special benefit of “incorrigible enemies of *the church!*”

The beast should be accoutred with panniers, one of which (its lid contrived so that it could not be closed) should be supplied with images for penitents to kiss; crucifixes, beads, and bits of paper for young and simple saints, and passports through purgatory for old and doubtful saints, and masses and prayers for dead sinners.—It should bear an inscription visible to all, “Bring hither an offering, and pay thy vows unto God!”

The other should be contrived with a closed lid, the raising of which would start into activity a hundred curs, serpents and vipers, trained to repel by every terrific sound and attitude of which they were capable, or of winning by affecting the most dove-like innocence, according as the fiend should indicate that the applicant was demanding a fee for his services—the price of his soul—or a contribution to en-

lighten and improve mankind. It should have a double inscription—the first, (to be exhibited to the faithful, and others of whose *conversion* there was hope) should be, “*Blessed charity!*” The second, (to be exhibited to *infidels* and “dividers of the body of Christ”) should be this: “*Will a man rob God!*”

It should be the stated work of the angel to adjust the mask and dress of the ape, to light the match when it was prudent to use brimstone, and to deal out or guard the contents of the panniers.

But to give the picture a nearer approach to truth, this monstrous combination should be placed in a broad and crowded field, with its army of menials and worshippers, and its multitude of victims.

All the brutal stupidity, all the senseless gravity, all the revolting derangement of natural and moral order, all the falsehood and hypocrisy, all the selfishness and malignity, all the blasphemous depravity towards God and towards man, which could be brought out in such a portrait, is essential to the very existence of Popery.

It presents an incessant offering, the most corrupt and offensive to heaven; it scatters, to the extent of its power, every blighting curse over the earth, and it is the most effectual device for defeating or overturning the whole plan of God's salvation, which looks to the world to come. All this, God has declared it to be; all this, the history of the world (and no portions so fully as those where it has had full sway,) has proved it to be. The scenes of judgment and eternity can alone unfold its true character. And this grand complication of abominations and curses is to continue, till man's probationary state is closed up, by the ushering in of the scenes of judgment and eternity, at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The truth of this last statement will be settled, incontrovertibly, by presenting the

#### PROPHETIC DESTINY OF POPERY. .

In connection with this branch of our argument, the writer can hardly refrain from alluding to his own history at the time, when he first listened to the views of Mr. Miller. There are thousands, doubtless, entertaining as sincerely and strongly the same views he then held, who know not, because they

have never examined the word of God upon the subject, that they are without any foundation. The writer at the time referred to, was as well assured, in his own mind, that the world was to be converted before the second advent of the Savior, as he was that twice two make four; indeed, it was received as a self-evident truth, in reference to which no doubts were to be admitted. In this faith he listened to several lectures by Mr. Miller, and of course every thing he advanced which conflicted with it, seemed like a silly farce. It was, perhaps, the third or fourth lecture, in which Mr. Miller brought the strength of his scriptural arguments to bear directly upon this point: Are we to have the millennium before or after the advent of Christ and the judgment? Then came the strife between the claims of truth and regard for the good opinion of others—between pride and prejudice on one hand, and duty and conscience on the other. Must I, after all, share the odium of this new doctrine? Must I become a hated “Millerite?” Must I yield to this despised old man, whom I consented to hear, more because fairness and candor demanded it, than I might oppose him fairly, as I intended to do, than because I expected to be profited or even gratified!

In the midst of this inward strife, this thought occurred to me, and nothing was ever more welcome: Now, all that can be known on these questions is in the Bible; if Mr. Miller's arguments are founded on the Bible, I shall not yield to him, but to the Bible; and I can afford to believe the Bible at any cost. As soon as this service is over, I will go home and settle this matter at once by the Bible. I did so; and, turning to those portions of prophecy, which all admit carry us down to the judgment and the coming of the Lord, at the end of the world, I saw at a glance that there was *no room* for the millennium before these events, inasmuch as the time was all filled up by great organizations of wickedness, which are to make war and prevail against the saints of the Most High, *until* the judgment.—That the earth, on account of these wicked powers, was to be the subject of “woes,” and “torments,” and “plagues,” which should become more and more severe, being proportioned to the guilt which called them down upon the world, even to the “last woe,” and the “last plagues,” which accompany the judgment itself, under the personal and presiding agency of the Son of God.

I saw that the conversion of the world or the millennium, before the Advent and judgment, was a philosophical and

moral impossibility.—That the world could not all be loving and serving God, and these great anti-christian organizations exist at the same time, any more than two bodies could be put into a space, which either one of them would fill, at the same time ; and that if the world were converted, it could not then be the subject of these plagues. That question was settled.

Among the most prominent of these great forms of wickedness was the Papacy. It was so fully and positively identified, that scarcely a difference of opinion existed among those who encouraged the use of the Bible, concerning it—so clearly, that it was one grand reason why the Papacy itself hated the Bible—so clearly that every one of its prophetic features, chronological, geographical, political, ecclesiastical and moral, could be traced in its history with as much ease and accuracy as one could point out the lines and folds and shades of an individual's countenance and dress, in a perfect Daguerrotype likeness of the individual.

We now call attention to the sure word of prophecy. As we shall refer only to those portions about the application of which there is no room for a question, we begin with a familiar portion, from the 7th chapter of Daniel.

That which relates to Popery, by showing its connection with the fourth beast, Rome, commences with verse 7 :—

And I saw in the night visions, and, behold, a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly ; and it had great iron teeth : it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it : and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it ; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots : and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things. I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool : his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire, a fiery stream issued and came forth from before him : thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him : the judgment was set, and the books were opened. I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake ; I beheld even till the beast was slain and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame.

I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him ; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom, that which shall not be destroyed.

I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood

by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth, but the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever."

Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.

*I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, UNTIL THE ANCIENT OF DAYS CAME, AND JUDGMENT WAS GIVEN TO THE SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH: AND THE TIME CAME THAT THE SAINTS POSSESSED THE KINGDOM.*

Thus he said, "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings; and he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, (and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end.) And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. Hitherto is the end of the matter.

A remark or two here will be sufficient to show the bearing of this portion of prophecy upon the question now under discussion—the impossibility of the world's conversion.

1. Nothing can be more certain than this:—the powers denoted by the fourth beast and little horn must continue till the final judgment. At that time the beast is to be destroyed and given to the burning flame. The little horn is to make war with the saints, and prevail against them until the Ancient of days comes, and judgment is given to the saints of the Most High, and they possess the kingdom—the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven—an everlasting kingdom; and at that time the little horn is also to be destroyed, at the end. The prophecy embraces the whole field of time and eternity—the saints are in subjection, or in a state of doubtful warfare, *till time ends*—they triumph at the judgment, and by the judgment—and their triumph is eternal. So that whatever powers may here be denoted by the beast and his little horn, the conversion of the world is absolutely precluded.

2. No other application of this prophecy has ever been, or can ever be, sustained, but that which refers the fourth beast to Rome—the ten horns to the ten principal divisions of Rome, and the little horn to the Papacy, which arose “among” them, and “after” them, and before whom “three” of them fell, on account of their opposition to its superstition and lordly ambition.

#### THE PAPACY IS ANTI-CHRIST.

The testimony of Paul is equally clear, and equally decisive :—

“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means : for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition ; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped ; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that when I was with you, I told you these things? and now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work : only he who now letteth [hindereth,] will let, [hinder,] until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming : even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish ; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie : that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”  
2 Thess. ii. 1—12.

1. This portion embraces the entire field from the days of the apostles to the coming of Christ, and this must be his literal and personal coming, (*tes parousias*,) since, if there is any other sense in which his coming is spoken of, it is impossible that his coming, in any other sense, was not then at hand.

2. This great anti-christ—“the Son of Perdition,”—cannot come into existence in the future, as some of the Papists would have us believe, for it existed, incipiently, in Paul’s day. He cannot be found in any person or body of men which may have existed in the past, for it is to be in existence when Christ comes. It has already come into existence, it is now in existence, it must exist till the end.



3. Its chronological, moral and ecclesiastical description can apply to no other power but the Papacy. Although in existence and working in the days of Paul, it was to be fully developed—"revealed,"—as the successor of what then withheld, or hindered, as soon as that should be taken out of the way.—What could that hindering agency be? Imperial Rome! This is the only answer which can be given. And it is the boast of the Papacy, and the uniform testimony of history, that the latter not only arose on the ruins of the former, but that "the Church" received both her territory and her legal power from the Empire. From that point it was to become superlatively notorious till destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming. Morally, it is "the mystery of iniquity,"—(Daniel's mysterious abomination that *astonisheth*?) the offspring of an apostacy—"a falling away,"—and its development was to be "after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." Ecclesiastically, it was to be the great embodiment of religious error—not avowedly, but the perverter of the truth; a bulwark and ministry of corruption around those, who, having lost, or never enjoyed "the love of the truth," (and they must have had it before they could love or hate it,) should have no farther use for it, unless it could be so corrupted as to become the instrument of unrighteousness. And for this cause, God, who has said, "I will choose their delusions," sends them this strong delusion of the son of perdition, that they all might be damned who have pleasure in unrighteousness. But as if it were intended by Providence that the Papacy should become the most ready witness to her own condemnation, her infallible pope, Gregory the Great, in one of his furious contests with other usurpers, has declared that "whosoever claimed supremacy over the whole Church, was Anti-Christ." (*Croly*, p. 117.)

All the marks pointed out by the apostle are found in the great Papal Anti-Christ, and they can be found no where else. He points to the Papacy as Nathan's parable did to the royal sinner, "Thou art the man!" And since this great instrumentality of wickedness is to exist till the coming of Christ, is it not impossible that the world can be converted?

To the unequivocal and decisive testimony of Daniel and Paul, upon the destiny of Popery, shall we add that of John? Omitting the evident allusions to its character and agency in Rev. ix. 20, 21; and xi. 7—13, we begin with chapter 13th.

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth was as the mouth of a lion : and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death ; and his deadly wound was healed : and all the world wondered after the beast, and they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast : and they worshipped the beast, saying, "Who is like unto the beast ! who is able to make war with him ! " And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies ; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them : and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity : he that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

It is scarcely necessary to remark upon this portion, that it contemplates that part of the field embraced by the portion from Daniel, which was of the most special interest to him, as it has been to the true people of God generally—that which describes the monstrous fourth beast, and the little horn. Although the imagery varies in some of its details, its main features are here. The leopard, in Daniel, is the symbol of Greece ; the bear, of Medo-Persia ; the lion, of Babylon : instead of the Roman monster, we have the great red dragon, and this ten-horned beast of John is his offspring and successor.—He embodies in himself all that was odious (though glorious in the estimation of the world,) in the former great organizations of earthly power—and thus we see how the first three great beasts of Daniel have their lives prolonged after their dominion is taken away,—his relation to God and the saints is the same as that of Daniel's little horn, the period of his uninterrupted triumph is the same, and his fate is the same.

But that which fixes the application of this beast to the Papacy is this : he receives "his power, and his seat, and great authority," from the "great red dragon,"—which can refer to no other organized and visible power but imperial Rome—though it seems to refer also to "the devil." Now it is well known that the Pope claims to have received his "patrimony," which includes the capital of the ancient empire, from Constantine, as he also ascribes the origin of his

legal supremacy and authority to Justinian. The grant of the latter reads :—

“ As the *elder Rome* was the founder of the laws ; so was it not to be questioned that in her was the supremacy of the Pontificate.” (*Novella 9, Preamble.*) “ We therefore decree that the most holy Pope of the *elder Rome* is the first of all the priesthood.”—(Ib. 131.)

The great red dragon denotes the Roman organization under paganism ; the beast denotes the same organization under the Papacy. If any further proof were needed, it is supplied by these facts : the same world that worships the dragon, worships the beast also ; and the chronology of his uninterrupted triumph accords exactly with the history of the Papacy. Forty-two months—the same period of the time, times and an half, of Daniel—denotes, according to all orthodox interpreters, “ *twelve hundred and sixty years.*” Rome was conquered by the armies of Justinian in March, 538, in a war which was avowedly undertaken in behalf of “ the Catholic Church ;” and Rome was conquered by the armies of republican France, in a war which remodeled Popery, and the whole European system, at least for a time, in February 1798. The prophecy exactly corresponds with the Papacy ; it corresponds with nothing else ; it can have but one interpretation.

The views given by John of the later operations and fate of the Papacy is found in other parts of his prophecy. The sixth and seventh vials, which no quibbling can apply to any other events but those connected with the coming of Christ, and the end of man's present and probationary condition, brings to view both the Roman organization, as the beast, and the Church of Rome, as great Babylon, in this light :—

“ And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates ; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet ; for they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.

Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.

And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air : and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, ‘ It is done.’ And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings ; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth,

so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell : and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath."—Rev. xvi. 12—19.

The ultimate doom of the papal city, Great Babylon, is of so much interest to the Church above, that it is made the subject of a special visitation and communication to John. And in order to remove every difficulty in the way of her identification, a more detailed sketch of her geographical location, political history and relations, and of her moral and ecclesiastical character is given. All this precedes the picture of "the judgment" which awaits her. This special communication includes the whole of the 17th and 18th chapters, and the 19th, to verse 9th.

But as the Papacy, in her literal and central throne—in the extent of her ecclesiastical organization and relations—in the comprehensiveness of her typical offspring, and in the affinities of her political elements and institutions, is evidently brought to view by the Revelator as the great earthly counterpart of the true city and family of God, in their glorified condition ; and as the doom of the former is the date of the exaltation and perfection of the latter, we may very properly notice them in contrast.—One is the world's mistress—her prostitute—and her children, in assuming a place in the divine family, are bastards ; the other is the Lamb's wife—the glory of the world to come—and the mother of us all, who, like Isaac, are children of promise. Each one has her appropriate name, and the same celestial being, it seems, is commissioned to describe each of them to John :—

And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, "Come hither ; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters ; with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication."

So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness : and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.—And the woman was arrayed in pur-

And there came unto me one of the seven angels, which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, "Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife."

And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God. Having the glory of God ! And I saw no temple therein : for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.—And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it, for the glory of God did lighten it,

ple and scarlet-color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, And the nations of them which are having a golden cup in her hand full saved shall walk in the light of it : of abominations and filthiness of her and the kings of the earth do bring fornication : and upon her forehead their glory and honor into it. And was a name written, "MYSTERY! BABYLON THE GREAT the gates of it shall not be shut at all BY DAY : for there shall be no night THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS there. And they shall bring the AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE glory and honor of the nations into it. EARTH."\* . . . . . And there shall in no wise enter into

And I saw the woman drunken it any thing that defileth, neither with the blood of the saints, and with whatsoever worketh abomination, or the blood of the martyrs of Jesus : maketh a lie ; but they which are and when I saw her I wondered with written in the Lamb's book of life.— great admiration. Rev. xxi. 9—11, 22—27.

And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth.—Rev. xvii. 1—6, 18.

The contemplation of the one excited the highest wonder on the part of the prophet, which is the occasion of a more minute description ; perhaps, also, because she constitutes the greatest snare and danger to the people of God, while the other is to constitute their home, their secure resting-place, and eternal reward : the latter was evidently more familiar, and therefore excited no such emotions.

And the angel said unto me, "Wherefore didst thou marvel ? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which had the seven heads and ten horns. The beast that thou sawest, was, and is not ; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition :—and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world,) when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is."—Rev. xvii. 7, 8.

The text "The beast that was, and is not, and yet is," should probably be translated "that was, and is not, and is at hand." The true reading in the original seems to be, (*kai parestin.*) The reading is supported by MSS., it differs in the slightest possible degree from the common reading, (*kai per estin.*) so far as the letters are concerned ; and it has the advantage of fully agreeing with the former clause of the verse, "The beast that thou sawest, was, and is, and shall ascend," of which it is indeed but a repetition.—(*Croly*, p. 176.)

In the explanation of "the mystery," which follows, are found those marks by which the application of this symbolic woman is determined to belong to the city of Rome, in its papal state :—

\* "Is not this Paul's "mystery of iniquity!"

(9.) And here is the mind which hath wisdom : The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. (10.) And there are seven kings : five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come ; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. (11.) And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition.

(12.) And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet ; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. (13.) These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. (14.) These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them : for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings ; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.

(15.) And he said unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.

(16.) And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire, (17.) for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled.—Rev. xvii. 9—17.

Verses 12, 13, 15. In these verses we have an exhibition of the mutual relationship between this sorceress city and the "waters" or multitudes, which give existence to the beast, (xiii. 1, 7,) and the ten horns or kingdoms of the beast, into which these multitudes are organized.—They "carry" her ; she makes them "drunk with the wine of her fornication."

The only question which has ever arisen upon the interpretation of the symbol, worthy of consideration, is this : does this woman refer to the city of Rome in its pagan or papal state ? That it cannot refer to the pagan city is evident from this well-known historical fact. The ancient city had fallen before the ten kings arose. The "death blow" was struck by Genseric, A. D. 455.

"Ver. 12. The prediction defines the epoch of the Papacy by the formation of the ten kingdoms of the western empire. "They shall receive power one hour with the beast." The translation should be, "in the same era," (*mian oran*.) The ten kingdoms shall be contemporaneous, in contradistinction to the "seven heads," which were successive.—(Croly, p. 179.)

Verses 9, 10. The seven heads of the beast denote, first, the literal features of the geographical location of the city,— "seven mountains ;" and, secondly, "seven kings," or forms of government which distinguished the papal European system. The geographical delineation is sufficient of itself to determine the application of the prophecy, since it is found true of but one city, and Roman Catholic, (see p. 225,) as well as Protestant interpreters, apply it to Rome.

"The site of Rome on the seven hills is a matter of such common knowledge as to prohibit quotation. But their name of mountains has been thought so far, too magnificent, as to be applicable only symbolically. For this there seems no necessity. Mons and Collis were formerly used without much distinction, and the "seven hills" are expressly called by a popular classic, "*septem dominos montes*." The evident purpose of the vision was to point out the city with a plainness beyond all mistake, and this it does in two ways: by a *circumstance*, in which it shared with no other, and by a *situation* equally peculiar. It designates the seat of the beast as at once the "mistress of the world," and the "city of the seven hills." Either designation perhaps strong enough, but combined, unanswerable."—(*Croly*, p. 177.)

"The translation, '*there are seven kings*,' is not sufficiently close to the original, (*ai hepta kephalai ore eisi hepta—kai Basileis hepta eisi*.)"—(*Croly*.) "And are seven kings," would evidently be the true reading. The kingdoms denoted by these heads have been supposed to be, 1st. The Roman state, under the different forms of government which existed at different periods of its history. 2d. The great monarchies which had oppressed the people of God, Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, and Greece, to which imperial Rome, the supreme power in the days of the prophet, became the successor, and to whose policy and vices she became the heir; the empire was succeeded by the triumphant barbarians, whose dominion continued but for "a short space"—their restless hordes constituting the troubled "sea," out of which arose the new order of things,—the "beast," under the Papacy. In either case, the beast which supports the woman is necessarily crowded into the times of the Papacy.

Verse 11. The grand organization which constitutes the beast, is also an eighth head of the beast.

This new European system is distinct from the former great persecuting governments of the world, and yet it is like them. Individually, and as a beast, it is distinct, though it has appropriated to itself much that was peculiar to its predecessors; as "a head" it is placed in the great draconic family. This, however, is to be the last of the family, for its fate is, it "goeth into perdition,"—from whence it originated.

Verse 14. The circumstances under which, and the agencies by which, the powers which constituted the beast are to meet their fate, are anticipated; and as the details are given more fully, in another portion, we shall insert it here.—It is evidently a separate view of what is merely glanced at, in this connection, just as the particulars of "Babylon the Great,"

now under consideration, is a distinct and expanded view of what is merely glanced at in the vials, (Rev. xvi. 19,) and as the view of the Lamb's wife, (xxi. 9 ;—xxii. 5,) gives the particulars of what is brought to view, in brief, in connection with the fate of "the great whore."—(Rev. xix. 7—9.) It is as follows:—

And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse ; and he that sat upon him was called " Faithful and True," and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns ; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood : and his name is called " The Word of God."

And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations : and he shall rule them with a rod of iron : and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, " KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

And I saw an angel standing in the sun ; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, " Come, and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God ; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great."

And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. *These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone.* And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth : and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.—Rev. xix. 11—21.

V. 16. If this verse has not already been fulfilled, in the premonitory infliction of vengeance, experienced by the Pope-dominion in connection with the French revolution, it certainly is to come in immediate connection with the advent of Christ, and the judgment. This great papal whore has been the crowned and titled leader among the crowned and titled leaders of the great anti-christian mob, the mob at length turn to fulfil the words of God upon their deceiver. " With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." " He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity." The final infliction of vengeance upon the deceived and the deceiver, is reserved for the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

V. 17. The angel here assures us that all these wonderful and eventful scenes are under the control of the Great Ruler



of nations, and limited by his purposes, as unfolded in his word.

V. 18. The explanation of the mystery is finished, so that this profane personage may be identified beyond a doubt.

The following chapter, (Rev. xviii.) unfolds the scene, with which it was the express design of the angel in this interview, to make John acquainted—"the judgment of the great whore." The prophet is, evidently, still upon the mountain to which he was carried "in the spirit," and there has a view of what awaits "that great city." We cannot, however, dwell here upon the successive parts in the scene, or upon the parties brought to view; we must pass to that portion which shows that her doom is to take place at the time of the marriage of the Lamb; and as this must be after man's probationary state has ended, the possibility of the world's conversion is cut off.

And let us here resume the contrast of these two cities, in a few points farther.—One is the offspring and ally of "perdition," the other "comes down from God out of heaven." One is "the habitation of devils," the other is "the tabernacle of God." One gives to the nations, "the golden cup of her abominations," and "the fruits their soul lusted after," the other supplies "the nations of the saved," with "the waters of life," and "the fruit of the tree of life."

We have seen that the seven heads of the beast symbolized the seven hills of Rome—the foundations of the literal and central throne of the Papacy; the literal foundations of the holy city are thus stated: "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was of jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst."—Rev. xxi. 14, 18—21.

The seven heads also symbolized the kingdoms whose political elements were embodied in the polity of Rome.—Literally, she sits upon the seven hills; morally and politically, she is sustained by the spirit and policy of her great earthly predecessors. So the holy city. Literally, she is to sit upon these glorious foundations; morally and politically, she is

"built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles," to be upheld by the spirit and institutions, of which the old theocracy was the type—in these foundations are seen "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." In one is "found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus, and of all that were slain upon the earth," and though she boasts of being "apostolic," the apostrophe of the angel, over her fall, is as follows :

" Rejoice over her, thou heaven,  
And ye holy apostles and prophets,  
For God hath avenged you on her ! "

The other bears upon her gates and walls the apostolic seal. One "glorifies herself" in time, the other is to be glorified through eternity, by "the glory of God." All who dwell in the one, and live deliciously with her, are to "receive of her plagues"—the smoke of which shall "rise up forever and ever ;" of the "pilgrims and strangers," for whom God hath prepared the other, it is said :

" Behold ! the tabernacle of God is with men !  
And He will dwell with them ;  
And they shall be His people.  
And God himself shall be with them—their God !  
And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.  
And there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying ;  
Neither shall there be any more pain !  
For the former things are passed away.  
And there shall be no more curse !  
But the throne of God and the Lamb shall be in it :  
And His servants shall serve Him ;  
And they shall reign forever and ever !

At the fall of one, the kings of the earth—the merchants—the ship-masters—the companies in ships—the sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stand afar off, when they see the smoke of her burning, and cast dust on their heads, and cry, weeping and wailing, saying,

" Alas, alas, that great city, Babylon, that mighty city !  
For in one hour is thy judgment come."

And the response which immediately follows the rejoicings of heaven, over her fall, assures us that that event is to be closely connected with the marriage of the Lamb:—

"And after these things, I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying,

## HALLELUIAH !

Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power  
 Unto the Lord our God !—  
 For true and righteous are his judgments.  
 For he hath judged the great whore,  
 Which did corrupt the earth with her fornication,  
 And hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hands !

And again they said,— . . . . . HALLELUIAH !

And her smoke rose up forever and ever.

And the four and twenty elders, and the four beasts, (*z o a*,  
*living creatures*,) fell down and worshipped God, that sat on  
 the throne, saying,

Amen, HALLELUIAH !

And a voice came out of the throne, saying,

Praise our God, all ye his servants ;  
 And ye that fear Him, both small and great !

And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and  
 as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty  
 thunders, saying,

## HALLELUIAH !

For the Lord God omnipotent reigneth !  
 Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to Him,  
 For the marriage of the Lamb is come,  
 And His wife hath made herself ready ! ”

## SUM OF THE TESTIMONY.

We are now prepared to sum up the evidence upon the prophetic destiny of the Papacy. 1. By the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every word be established. Daniel, Paul, and John agree, in testifying that a great organization shall rise up in opposition to God, his truth and people, which they denominate the “little horn”—“the mystery of iniquity”—“mystery, Babylon the great ;” that this organization is to “make war and prevail against the saints of the Most High, until the judgment”—that it is to be “destroyed by the brightness of Christ’s coming”—that its fall is to introduce the immortal state, where “there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, and there shall be no more curse, for the former things are passed away.” And this is sufficient to settle the question, that the world can never be converted to the truth as it is in Jesus.

2. They all point us with sufficient clearness, (Daniel and John place the matter beyond a rational doubt) to Rome, as the earthly origin and location of this organization; and they all bring it to view as the successor of the great oppressors of mankind, and persecutors of the true church. And this is done with such a minuteness and variety of detail, and such a repetition of outline, that the design of the Great Author cannot be misapprehended, nor can the subject of the several descriptions be found anywhere but in the Papacy.

3. The testimony of John upon the time when the Papacy meets its fate, is of the strongest character possible. This falls under the seventh vial, in which is "filled up the wrath of God," and which is connected with a distinct announcement of the coming of Christ "as a thief." It can have but one application. Again, the beast which carries the Papacy, "goeth into perdition." This, as we have seen, is explained to refer to the final disposition of a distinct body of the enemies of Christ, by "casting them alive into the lake of fire." It is to be executed by the Son of God himself.

The vengeance which the ten kingdoms of the beast execute upon the Papacy, if it has not taken place, may precede their destruction, a very little time, but as they "agree and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God are fulfilled," their vengeance upon her can only be a separate act in that part of the drama, which makes up the catastrophe of all the enemies of God. It necessarily falls under the last vial, and can be fulfilled only in connection with the advent of the King of kings.

Finally, by connecting so intimately the sudden and violent casting down of "that great city, Babylon," with the marriage of the Lamb, and as that introduces the eternal state, we are brought, by this threefold testimony of one prophet, and the combined and harmonious testimony of three prophets, to the necessary and only admissible conclusion,—The conversion of this world, in the popular sense, *is not in the plans, purposes, or prophecies of the God of the Bible!*

It would be highly interesting to inquire into the predicted state of the Papacy at the time of her fall, not only as a proof of the condition of the world, but especially as a sign of the times; we can, however, only refer in the briefest manner to one or two statements, and then pass to notice the modern history of Popery.

The fall of the papal metropolis is brought to view in three distinct portions of the Revelation—in the fourteenth, the sixteenth and the eighteenth chapters; and in the first and last of these portions, the condition of the Papacy is plainly stated, or necessarily implied.—In the fourteenth chapter, the fall of “that great city” is grouped with “the hour of judgment,” the fate to be executed upon those who “worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark,” the time of trial to “the saints,” the “rest” of them “that die in the Lord,” and the final “harvest.” It is stated in these terms: “And there followed another angel, saying,

Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city !  
Because she made all nations drink  
Of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.”

Now it must be very evident, that if Babylon makes all nations drink of her cup, she must be in a condition to enable her to do so, and by some means or other she puts the cup to their lips and makes them drink. But the annunciation of “the third angel,” by designating the subjects of special wrath to be those who “worship the beast,” instead of “Him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters,” plainly implies that the great mass of Christendom will then acknowledge, in form or principle, the corruptions and assumptions of the papal heresy; and that this time of prevailing corruption is to be a time of peculiar trial to “the saints,” and “them that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.”

The beast is to be in league with the woman till the words of God are fulfilled, and her fall is immediately succeeded by the infliction of wrath upon those that worship the beast.—It takes place “without the city.” According to this portion it appears that the Papacy meets its fate as the most distinguished, and of course triumphant enemy of God.

The other portion shows, still more clearly, that the Papacy is to be in this triumphant state, as to this world, at the time of its fall: “And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying,

Babylon the great is fallen ! is fallen !  
And is become the habitation of devils,  
And the hold of every foul spirit,  
And a cage of every unclean and hateful bird !

For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication ;  
 And the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her ;  
 And the merchants of the earth are waxed rich  
 Through the abundance of her delicacies !

And I heard a voice from heaven, saying,

                  Come out of her, my people,  
 That ye be not partakers of her sins,  
 And that ye receive not of her plagues !  
 For her sins have reached unto heaven,  
 And God hath remembered her iniquities !  
 Reward her even as she rewarded you,  
 And double unto her double according to her works,  
 The cup which she hath filled, fill to her double !

How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously,  
 So much torment and sorrow give her !

                  For she saith in her heart,  
 ' I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow ! '   
 ' Therefore shall her plagues come in one day—  
 Death, and mourning, and famine !  
 And she shall be utterly burned with fire,  
 For strong is the Lord God who judgeth her ! ' "

Here, again, " all nations " drink of her cup, and the kings and merchants of the earth court her favor. Her sins reach the climax as the fatal blow is given ; in the day when her widowhood is forgotten, and every source of sorrow seems to be dried up, her plagues fall upon her, and she is to be found no more at all.

Whether the condition of the Papacy, at the present time, corresponds with, or is approaching to, that brought to view in these portions of prophecy, must be obvious to all who are acquainted with the current news of the day ; and we shall endeavor to make it appear, should we be permitted to perform the task laid out in this article.

As it was with her old prototype, so the Babylon of the Christian age has had all nations put in subjection to her—(see Jer. xxvii.) her time of triumph and of trial is appointed—the agent by whom her doom is to be executed (not Cyrus, but Jehovah's Anointed,) is designated ; at her fall the people of God come out of her to return with singing unto Zion, and then the days of their mourning shall be ended.

Belshazzar's impious feast, at which the vessels of the temple of God were profaned, was the sign that the time to thresh old Babylon had come ; a similar position of profane exultation will mark the time for the destruction of this Christian Babylon.

H—x.

[To be continued.]

## ART. XIV.

*The Seventh Month Movement—its History—its Results  
—Defects in the Argument.—Our Position.*

THE late movement, in connection with the seventh month of the Jewish sacred year, was the most marked and striking event that has occurred in connection with the doctrine of the Second Advent, since the commencement of the present interest respecting it. It is well deserving a passing notice ; and its history is interesting, not only as a memento of the past, but also as a landmark for the future.

The first public reference made to the seventh month as the time of the Lord's Advent, was by Mr. Miller, in a letter, which appeared in the "Signs of the Times," of May 17th, 1843. In this letter, he alluded to the various events which had occurred, and to the several observances of the Jewish law which were commemorated, in the seventh month. As many of these were typical of events predicted to transpire in immediate connection with the Second Advent, it was considered as highly probable that in their antitypical fulfillment they might be fulfilled *chronologically*.

Thus it was shown the ark rested on the seventeenth day of the seventh month.\* At a later period, on the same day of this month, the sanctuary, and worshippers, and all appertaining to it, were cleansed.† On the tenth day of this month, the Israelites were annually required to afflict their souls, from the evening of the ninth to the evening of the tenth.‡ In this month, from the first to the fifteenth, was an annual holy convocation of all Israel.§ On the fifteenth day, was the great Feast of Tabernacles, or of Ingathering, when all Israel were assembled before the Lord.|| On the tenth day of this month, every fiftieth year, the great trumpet was sounded throughout all the land, when every man was restored to his possession, and all bond-men went free.¶ And on the tenth day of this month, the high priest made atonement for all Israel, when the inner sanctuary was sprinkled with

---

\* Gen. viii. 4. † Lev. xvi. 29—34. ‡ Lev. xxiii. 27—32. § Lev. xxiii. 24. Num. xxix. 1. ¶ Lev. xxiii. 34. ‖ Kings viii. 2. ¶ Lev. xxv. 9, 10.

the blood of the kid, slain for a sin-offering ; and the scape goat on which was laid the sins of all Israel, was led away into the wilderness—a type of him who bore our sins and carried our sorrows.\*

The anniversaries of so many observances, all centering in this month, made it a point of much interest. As such, it was presented by Mr. Miller ; not as being conclusive evidence of the time in the year of the Lord's Advent, but as a question worthy of our prayerful consideration. It, however, attracted but little notice at the time : a few regarded it with much interest, and when that month in 1843 had passed, such were disappointed ; but the great body of Adventists regarded it with but little favor.

As time continued beyond A. D. 1843, many began to inquire the reasons of their disappointment respecting the year of their expected deliverance. It was then seen, that commencing all the prophetic periods in the years B. C., where we had always dated their commencement, they would not be respectively completed, even upon the supposition that our chronology and date of their commencement were correct, until some time within the year 1844. Thus, of the seven times, or 2520 years, commencing in B. C. 677—the great jubilee, or 2450 years, commencing in B. C. 607—and the 2300 years of Daniel, commencing in B. C. 457—as a portion of each of those years, from which the prophetic periods were respectively dated, had expired before the occurrence of the several events which marked their commencement, it would be necessary that they should extend as far into A. D. 1844, as they respectively commenced after the beginning of the years B. C. from which they are severally reckoned, in order, either to complete the number of years in each, or to test the correctness of our chronology. But there was no clue to the time, in the respective years B. C., at which the several periods began ; and consequently the time in the year of their termination, could not be accurately marked.

During this time, however, some who had embraced the view that the ceremonials of the Mosaic law, typical of Christ's Second Advent, would be fulfilled *chronologically*, began to present their views with the evidence, which to their minds, went to prove that the Advent of the Lord, whenever it should occur, would be on the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish sacred year.

---

\* Lev. xvi. 1—34. Isa. liii. 4.



The argument was that at Christ's First Advent, several of the Jewish observances, typical of that event, were fulfilled chronologically, and that, consequently, those which were typical of his Second Advent, must also be fulfilled chronologically. Thus, the Passover, commemorating that memorable night in which the children of Israel departed from the land of Egypt, was typical of Christ—"our Passover;" and as the paschal lamb was slain on the 14th day of the month Abib, so Christ was crucified on the 14th of the same month. As the sheaf of the first fruits was waved before the Lord for a wave-offering on the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath of the Paschal Week, so our Great High Priest arose on the first day of the week, the morrow after the Jewish Sabbath of the Paschal week, "the first fruits of those that slept." And as the Feast of Pentecost—the Feast of Weeks, was commemorated on the fiftieth day from the waving of the sheaf of First Fruits, so when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and the disciples were all with one accord in one place, the Holy Spirit descended as a rushing mighty wind, accompanied by miraculous gifts.

These remarkable events being chronologically fulfilled, it was argued that the various other types, "the shadows of good things to come," must be fulfilled in like manner. Thus the blowing of the great trumpet in the year of Jubilee, on the tenth day of the seventh month,—a type of the trump of God, the last trump; the release of all captives, the canceling of all debts, and the restoration of every man to his possessions, on the same day,—typical of the great release; and the atonement of the High Priest for the sins of all Israel, his intercession therefor in the Holy of Holies, and his coming out from thence to bless the waiting congregation,—typical of the completion of the intercession which Christ is now making, and of his coming out of heaven itself, to appear the second time unto those that looked for him, without sin unto salvation, it was argued, fully demonstrated, that a day thus selected and set apart of God for the observance of so many ceremonials, typical of the greatest of all events, must be honored in the completion of the plan of salvation by the event itself.

This supposition was greatly strengthened by the consideration that the observances of these ceremonials would bring us to the very time where all the prophetic periods might cen-

tre in their complete fulfillment, and beyond which, reckoning from those dates, they could not be well extended. It was also analogous to the dealings of God with his children in times past,—in the event of the Flood, in the destruction of “the Cities of the Plain,” the departure of the children from Egypt, and their entrance into the land of Canaan,—to make known, a short time previous to the fulfillment of a chronological prophecy, the very day of its occurrence. Although the time to the flood was revealed to man 120 years previous to that event, and the time of the sojourning of God’s chosen people in a strange country 400 years, yet the precise days of the termination of those periods, were not made known until a very short time previous to their fulfillment. If there was any force in the analogy of the past, we certainly had reason to believe, as a revelation had been made of the great periods reaching to the Advent, that before its occurrence the very day of our deliverance might be made known to us.

As the mariner, tossed upon the tempestuous ocean for many long tedious days, with joy receives the first intimation of the long wished-for land, so many an humble soul, who fearlessly had risked their earthly all in patient looking for the King of kings, felt a new thrill of joy, and their hearts quicker throb, when they listened to arguments designed to prove the day of Christ’s return. Thus, although a definite day was at first generally opposed, yet there were numbers in every place to whom it was as water to the thirsty soul, and who received it as the earth drinketh up the rain; so that it gradually spread through all the south of New England, and in the Middle States. Still, great numbers of the Adventists opposed it,—some being intellectually convinced that the arguments would not warrant all the stress laid upon them, nor the positiveness with which they were regarded, while others opposed it without giving the argument a critical examination, having a general dislike to the preaching of a definite day. But as this view continued to be presented, many of this class embraced it, until it began to be the prevailing opinion in many of the Advent bands. The lecturers, however, most of them, and the several Advent papers, for several months stood aloof from it.

While this was being preached in the south of New England, there was an awakening among the Adventists in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine; and a strong conviction prevailed among them of the Lord’s being at the very door,

but without reference to any definite day. These were all prepared to receive the definite time, whenever it should be presented to them. When the Advent cause was at this crisis, the Exeter Camp-meeting was held in August last, at which all these sections of country were fully represented. There the argument for the time was forcibly presented, and in connection with all the various questions of interest which had given new vigor to the cause in other sections. The result was, that the time was generally and enthusiastically received; and as the several brethren returned to their respective homes, they carried it with them, and it began to be the prevalent belief in every direction. And those who received it, believing it to be the truth, and feeling that if true it should be preached without delay, extended it far and near with all the eloquence and success that so joyful and probable an event could produce.

While this view of the time was so universally received, its fruits were also seen to be most beneficial.

#### ITS FRUITS.

It produced everywhere the most deep searching of heart and humiliation of soul before the God of high heaven. It caused a weaning of affections from the things of this world, a healing of controversies and animosities, a confession of wrongs, a breaking down before God, and penitent broken-hearted supplications to Him for pardon and acceptance. It caused self-abasement and prostration of soul, such as we never before witnessed. As God by Joel commanded, when the great day of God should be at hand, it produced a rending of hearts and not of garments, and a turning unto the Lord with fasting and weeping and mourning. As God said by Zechariah, a spirit of grace and supplication was poured out upon His children, they looked to Him whom they had pierced, there was a great mourning in the land, every family apart and their wives apart, and those who were looking for the Lord afflicted their souls before him. Such was its effect on the children of God.

While none could deny the possibility of the Lord's then coming, and as the fulfillment of some of the types chronologically at Christ's First Advent rendered it highly probable that those which typified the Second Advent would also be chronologi-

cally fulfilled, so general an awakening, and with such blessed fruits, could not but impress many minds ; and those who were not convinced of the soundness of the typical argument, were led to regard it as a fulfillment of the parable of the ten virgins in the 25th of Matthew,—as their arising to trim their lamps, after having gone forth to meet the Bridegroom, and slumbering while He tarried ; so that the definite time was finally embraced by nearly all of the Advent faith. So universal a movement among those who a short time before were comparatively asleep on this question, could not be unnoticed by the world. The wicked, consequently, flocked to the various places of meeting,—some out of idle curiosity to hear, others out of concern for their spiritual interests, and others still to scoff at solemn things. Those who believed they should so shortly stand in their Savior's presence, and whose works corresponded with their faith, could not but feel a nearness of access to God and sweet communion with him ; and the souls of such were greatly blessed. With a realizing sense of such a nearness of the greatest of all events, as we came up to that point of time, all other unnecessary cares were laid aside, and the whole soul was devoted to a preparation for the great event. God being more ready to give than we are to receive, does not permit any thus to plead in vain ; and His Holy Spirit came down, like copious showers upon the parched earth. It was then evident that there was faith upon the earth, such faith as is ever ready to act in accordance with what the soul believes that God has spoken,—such faith as would, in obedience to a supposed command, bid all the pleasures of this world adieu, having respect to the recompense of reward. Such was a faith like that of Abraham's, when, at the command of God, he went out “ not knowing whither he went,” nor withheld his only son ; and here were those all ready to join the multitude, who through faith will inherit the promises.

#### THE TIME IN OUR YEAR OF THE TRUE SEVENTH MONTH.

As it was believed that the types predicted the Advent of the Lord on the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish sacred year, it was necessary to harmonize the Jewish time with our present calendar, to ascertain what day, according to our reckoning, would synchronize with that day of the

Jewish year. According to the Rabbinical reckoning, it fell this year on the 23d of our *September*; and many of the religious editors and their correspondents have made themselves quite merry that the Adventists should have supposed it synchronized with the 22d of *October*,—"not one of the Adventists," as these learned men say, "having discovered the mistake." From a full and careful review and examination of the question, we are still convinced that the true Jewish seventh month could only synchronize with our October,—commencing with the first appearance of the new moon on the 13th of that month, and ending with the appearance of the new moon on the 11th of November.

According to the Levitical law, the Jewish year began with the month "*Abib*," which signifieth "*green-ears*." All the Oriental nations, from the Chinese in the east, to the Latins in the west, with the exception of the Egyptians, commenced their year at about the vernal equinox.\* From this fact Dr. Hales argues that it was the anniversary of the commencement of the primitive year.† The Egyptians began their year near the autumnal equinox, when the waters of the Nile, in their annual flood, were at their greatest height. While the Israelites were in Egypt, they conformed to the Egyptian mode of computing time; but on their departure, the original year in their reckoning was retrieved. The month in which they left the land of their captivity, was thenceforth to be reckoned their first month. In Exodus xii. 2, we read that God spake unto Moses, saying, "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you." And this month, we learn by Exo. ix. 31, 32, was about the time when the barley was in the ear, and the flax was bolled," but "the wheat and the rye were not grown up." In the tenth of this month, the children of Israel were commanded to take a lamb of the first year without blemish, and to keep it until the fourteenth day of the same month, when the whole assembly of the congregation were to kill it in the evening—(margin) "between the two evenings," which was, as we read in Deut. xvi. 6, "at even, at the going

\* Hales' New Anal. Chro. Vol. 1. p. 135.

† He says:—"The first sacrifice on record seems to decide the question. The time of the sacrifice of Cain and Abel evidently appears to have been in the spring, when Cain, who was a tiller of the ground, brought the first fruits of his tillage, or a sheaf of new corn; and Abel, who was a feeder of sheep, the firstlings of his flock, lambs; and this was done 'at the end of days,' or 'at the end of the year;' which is the correct meaning of the phrase, indefinitely rendered 'in process of time,' as in our public translation of Gen. iv. 3."—*Ib.* p. 137.

down of the sun." \* In that memorable night, they were to leave the land of Egypt, out of which God brought them, in accordance with his word. In commemoration of that event, they were commanded annually, in the fourteenth day of the first month at even, to eat the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month, was to be the feast of unleavened bread, which was to be eaten for seven days. On the morrow after the Sabbath during this feast, a sheaf of the first fruits of the barley harvest, was to be waved before the Lord."—Leviticus xxiii. 9—14.

As the Jews were obligated to conform to this requirement, they could never observe the passover until the barley harvest was ripe; nor could they defer it much after its ripening, as they could not eat of the harvest until the "wave-sheaf" had been offered by the priest. The Jews, we are told, commenced their months with the first *appearance* of the moon, which, in that climate, was usually the *second* evening after the change. And they commenced their year with the appearance of the new moon nearest the ripening of the barley harvest. Their years consisted sometimes of twelve and sometimes of thirteen moons, an intercalary moon being added about once in three years. If, on the appearance of the moon at the end of *Adar*, the 12th moon of the preceeding year, there was a probability that the barley would be ripe by the fourteenth day of the month, they made that moon the first month of their year; but if the barley would not probably be ripe till after the 14th day, they added the whole of that moon to the old year, calling it *Ve-Adar*, or the second *Adar*. If, therefore, we can ascertain the time in the year of the ripening of the barley harvest in Judea, we may know very nearly the commencement of the Jewish sacred year.

---

\* According to Dr Hales, the first Passover, Ex. xii. 1—13, was thus observed:—"Each family had been previously required, at the beginning of the month *Abib*, (which, from henceforth, was made the first month of the sacred year, retrieving the original beginning of the year, in *spring*, about the vernal equinox,) to take a *lamb* without spot or blemish, upon the *tenth day* of the month, to keep it up, and to kill it on the *fourteenth, between the two evenings*, (the former of which began at the ninth hour, the latter at the eleventh, or sunset.) They were to roast it whole, and to eat it in *haste, not breaking a bone of it, with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, standing with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staves in their hands*, after the manner and posture of distressed pilgrims, who were setting out instantly upon a long journey, through a dreary wilderness, towards a pleasant land, where their toil and travel was to cease. And they were also required to sprinkle the blood of the *pascal* lamb, with a bunch of hyssop dipped therein, upon the lintel, or head post, and upon the two side posts of the doors of their houses, to save them from the destroyer, who, seeing this token, would *pass over* their houses, without entering, to smite them."—*New Analysis of Chronology*, Vol. II. Book I. p. 198.

The following items respecting the seasons in Palestine, are taken from an "Economical Calendar" of that country, by Johan Gotlieb Buhle, Fellow of the Philologic Seminary, at Brunswick, 1785. The Calendar was compiled from the researches of travellers of acknowledged authenticity, at the request of the Directors of the royal college at Gottingen, and may be found in full in "Calmet's Dictionary."

**FEB.** According to this Calendar, the snows and colds of winter begin to cease about the last of February, which month is remarkable for its excessive rains. In this month, the fields, which are only here and there green in January, are covered on every side with verdure. Barley is sometimes sown as late as the middle of this month. The peach and apple blossom, and peas and beans.

**MARCH.** The cold seldom continues till March, except on the tops of mountains. In this month, the weather is mostly warm and temperate, so that the heat of the sun is often inconvenient for travellers. The inundation of the river Jordan, caused by the melting of the snow on the mountains, is about the end of this month, at which time, *barley* is often ripe at Jericho, when it is about fourteen days earlier than at Jerusalem. In this month, every tree is in full leaf. The fig blossoms about the middle, and the Jericho plume, toward the end of it. The *latter rains* commence in this month, and continue into April; after which, none are observed until summer.

**APR.** In April, the heat begins to be extreme. The harvest falls out entirely according to the rainy season. After the rains cease, the corn soon arrives at maturity; but it usually remains in the fields a long time after it is ripe. *Barley* is ripe in the beginning of April, in the plain of Jericho, according to Mariti l. c. In all other parts of Palestine, it is in ear at this time, and the ears turn yellow about the middle of this month. (Shaw l. c.) Egmont and Korte inform us, that it is for the most part cut down this month. Almonds and oranges also ripen; and the grass begins to be very high.

**MAY.** In the month of May, the summer season commences, when the excessive heat of the sun renders the earth barren. Wheat is cut down in May, in Gallilee, but it is often not all gathered till the first of June. Frequently, *barley* is not all cut down until this month commences. Early apples are gathered this month.

At the present time, the Rabbinical Jews commence their year with the new moon nearest the vernal equinox, irrespective of the barley harvest ; so that their first month synchronizes with our March, and their seventh, with our September; but it is evident that as they disregard the ordinances of Moses and substitute for them their *traditions*, they are therefore of no authority as to the true time for the commencement of the Jewish year.

According to the Caraites Jews, the true year cannot commence until the appearance of the new moon in April. They are strict observers of the Mosaic law. REES, in his *Encyclopedia*, says of them :—

“ Upon the whole, the Caraites are universally reckoned men of the first learning, of the greatest piety, and of the purest morals of the whole nation.”

CALMET thus writes :—

“ *Caraites*, a sect of the Jews, implying persons consummate in the study of the Scriptures, and adhering closely to the letter of it. This distinguishes the Caraites from the Rabbins, who admit traditions. The Caraites pass for the most learned of the Jewish doctors.”

Of the Caraites, and Rabbinical Jews, Dr. Hales says :—

“ The Rabbinites held to oral tradition, and supposed that God dictated many things by word of mouth, to Moses on Mount Sinai, which were propagated in the traditions of the elders, and long after, were put in writing, lest they should be forgot. Hence, those maxims of their schools, ‘ the words of the Scribes are lovelier than the words of the law, the words of the elders are weightier than the words of the prophets.’ They were reprobated by our Savior for teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

“ There was a sect of the Scribes called Caraites or Scriptarians, who rejected the cabalistic or allegorical interpretations of Scripture, and contended for the literal sense. And if the literal was inadmissible, they endeavored to discover the figurative meaning by careful comparison of Scripture with itself, in parallel places.”—*New Anal. Chro. Vol. II. p. 788.*

The Caraites Jews maintain that the Rabbins have changed the calendar, so that to present the first fruits of the barley harvest on the 16th of Nisan, as the law directs, would be impossible, if the time is reckoned according to the Rabbinical calculation ; for barley is not in the ear, at Jerusalem, until a month later. The accounts of many travellers confirm the position of the Caraites. Mr. E. S. Colman, a converted Jew, who has been employed as a missionary to the Jews, in



Palestine, in an article published in the American Biblical Repository, for April, 1840, says :—

“ At present the Jews in the Holy land have not the least regard to this season appointed and identified by Jehovah, but follow the rules prescribed in the oral law, viz., by adding a month to every second or third year, and thus making the lunar year correspond with the solar. And when the fifteenth day of Nisan, according to this computation, arrives, they begin to celebrate the above-mentioned feast although the *chedesh haabib* may have passed or not yet come. In general, the proper season after they have celebrated it, is a whole month, which is just reversing the command in the law. Nothing like ears of green corn have I seen around Jerusalem at the celebration of this festival. The Caraites observe it later than the Rabbinical, for they are guided by *Abib*, and they charge the latter with eating unleavened bread during that feast. I think, myself, that the charge is well founded. If this feast of unleavened bread is not celebrated in its season, every successive festival is dislocated from its appropriate period, since the month Abib is laid down in the law of God, as the epoch from which every other is to follow.”

Jahn, in his *Archæology*, says, p. 111, 112, that

Moses “ obligated the priests to present at the altar on the second day of the passover, or in the sixteenth day after the first new moon in April, a ripe sheaf. For if they saw on the last month of the year that the grain would not be ripe, as expected, they were compelled to make an intercalation, which commonly happened on the third year.”

“ The Jewish Rabbins say, that March and Sept., instead of April and October, were the initial months of these two years. That they were so at a late period is admitted, but the change was probably owing to the example of the Romans, who began their year with the month of March. The Jews being pleased with their example in this respect, or overruled by their authority, adopted the same practice. That this is the most probable statement, is evident also from the fact, that the position of the Rabbins is opposed not only by *Josephus*, but by the usage of the Syriac and Arabic languages; from the fact, also, that the prescribed observances of the three great festival days will not agree with the months of March and September, as has been shown by Michaelis: see *Commentat. de Mensibus Hebræorum* in Soc. Reg. Goett.—1763—1768, p. 10. et. seq.”

Archbishop Usher even makes their year still later. In his *Annals of the World*, London ed. 1658, p. 26, he says :—

“ Upon the fourteenth day of the first month, (the fourth of May being our Tuesday,) in the evening, the Israelites celebrated their first passover, in the land of Canaan.—Jos. v. 10. Next day after the passover, (May 5th being Wednesday,) they ate of the fruit of the land of Canaan, unleavened bread and parched corn, and manna ceased the very day they began to live on the fruits of the land.—Jos. v. 11, 12.”

Again he says, page 40, “ The eighth day of the seventh month, (to wit, 30th of our Oct. being Friday,) was the first of the seven days of the dedication. The tenth day, (with us Nov 1st, upon a Saturday,) was the fast of expiation or atonement held, whereupon (according to the Levitical law, chapter 25 : 9,) the Jubilee was proclaimed by the sound of a trumpet. The 15th day (our November 6th, being Friday,) was the feast of taberna-

cles. The 22d, (our Nov. 13th, being also Friday,) was the last of the feast of tabernacles, which was also very solemnly kept.—2 Chron. viii. 9 ; with Levit. xxii. 36, and John vii. 37.”

It is therefore very evident from the foregoing testimony, that the Rabbinical Jews are incorrect in their time for their commencement of the Mosaic year ; so that, according to the Caraites reckoning and the ripening of the barley in Judea, the new moon of April is the proper commencement of the Jewish year. Consequently, this Jewish year began with the appearance of the moon on the 18th of April, bringing the pass-over on the 1st of May—an entire moon later than the Rabbinical passover. Reckoning from this moon, the seventh Jewish month commenced with the appearance of the moon on the 13th of October ; so that the tenth day of the seventh month synchronized with the 22d of that month.

A reference to the climate in Judea and the time of ingathering, shows that October is the true seventh month. Josephus, after speaking of the “seventh month” and the “fast” on the “tenth day,” says :—

“ Upon the fifteenth day of the same month, *when the season of the year is changing for winter*, the law enjoins us to pitch tabernacles in every one of our houses, so that *we preserve ourselves from the cold of that season of the year.*” Ant. B. 3. chap. 10.

By the “Economical Calendar” before referred to, we learn that the climate during the autumn, is as follows :—

**SEPT.** In September, the rainy season usually commences from the 18th to the 25th. The second clusters of the vine, which blossom in April, are ripe in this month ; and cotton is also gathered.

**OCT.** The rainy season in some years, does not commence in Palestine until October. Wheat, barley, millet, &c., are sown in this month ; and the third clusters of the grapes are gathered. The October rains, called early or former rains, follow about twenty or thirty days after the September rains.

**NOV.** November is reckoned among the rainy months. The trees retain their leaves, until about the middle of it. The nights are cold and uncomfortable.

**DEC.** December is the first winter month. The coldest weather is usually from the 12th of December, until the 20th of January. Snow seldom remains all day on the ground, and ice seldom forms sufficiently to bear a man.

The apostle Paul, in giving the history of his voyage to Rome, (Acts xxvii. 9,) says, that “when sailing was now

dangerous because the fast\* was already past," he admonished them that the voyage would be of much hurt to the lading of the ship and to their lives. And in a very few weeks they were shipwrecked on the island of Malta, (Melita) where they remained three months through the winter. (Acts xxviii. 11.) As they would not be able to depart until about the middle of February, they must have arrived at Malta about the middle of November, a few weeks after the fast. The following extract of a letter dated on board the U. S. Frigate Cumberland, Port Mahon, Oct. 25th, 1844, which we copy from the *Mercantile Journal* of Dec. 10th, is further evidence that the sailing in those seas becomes dangerous the last of October. The writer says:—

"We arrived here last night, after a tedious, boisterous passage of nine days from Malta. We had a succession of head winds, squalls, and rains, which were felt, in their full discomfort, after the series of pleasant weather we had experienced during our summer's cruise. The passage from Malta to this port is, perhaps, the worst in this sea; the approximation of Sicily and Africa, and the sprinkling of rocks and reefs in the Strait, make it one of anxiety for the navigator—while the constant prevalence of storms off the south point of Sardinia, has earned for it the name of the Cape Horn of the Mediterranean."

It is therefore evident that the seventh month must have commenced with the new moon in October; and that the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish Sacred year, in A. D. 1844, could only synchronize with the 22d of that month.

As that time drew nigh, the meetings of the respective Advent bands were marked by a deep solemnity of feeling, an all-prevailing sense of the presence of God's Holy Spirit, and a realizing expectancy of the Savior's appearing, at the time specified. For a short time before the 22d, secular business was in most cases laid aside, and Adventists every where gave themselves to the work of preparation for his coming, as they would prepare themselves were they on their bed of death, expecting soon to close their eyes forever on all earthly scenes. There were some cases of extravagance, as has been in all great movements; and it would be strange if there had not been; these were greatly exaggerated, and were thus circulated in connection with hundreds of reports which had no foundation in fact; but the general effect on the minds

\* The marginal note in our Polyglot Bibles, on the last mentioned verse 9, is as follows: "The fast was on the tenth day of the seventh month. Lev. xxiii. 27, 29." And this is the opinion of the most eminent Biblical scholars. Dr. Clark also says, that "to sail after this fast was proverbially dangerous among the ancient Jews."

and hearts of those who embraced that view, was salutary and permanent. The Advent bands were thus prepared for any contingency, and for any disappointment.

At length the day arrived, the long wished-for day, the day of hope and ardent expectation, the day that thousands looked to as the day that would release them from their earthly pilgrimage, and usher them into a state of endless joy. But it passed away. The sun arose and set, again arose, and disappeared again, until all hope that that was the appointed time which God would honor by Christ's appearing, expired in every breast. The expectation was proved to be premature. At first, the friends were sad, but still hoped on, believing a few days more would close the scene. The enemy came in like a flood; and dark and dreary was the prospect, unless the Lord should speedily come to save. But time continued on. The truth still shone forth from the sacred page. The slanders of the wicked were hurled back upon them, and the enemy fell back abashed. The Adventists were therefore cheered anew, their desponding hearts were reinvigorated, they saw this disappointment did not destroy their hopes that Christ will soon appear, and that the evidence of the Advent at the door, was unaffected by it. Consequently, they have renewed their strength, and are still toiling on, laboring in the cause, which they believe the cause of God, praying to be perfected in His love, and that they may with patience wait his Son from heaven; believing he may now at any moment come, and that his coming cannot be long delayed.

As we were disappointed in our expectations, based upon the argument of the chronological fulfillment of the types, it is necessary that we should examine

#### THE DEFECTS OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL ARGUMENT.

The argument was that as *some* of the types had been fulfilled chronologically, the remaining types must also be chronologically fulfilled. This argument would be logical as far as the analogy goes if *all* the types which have thus far been fulfilled, had been fulfilled chronologically. For, if some which have been fulfilled have not been chronologically fulfilled, it follows that those which are yet to be fulfilled, may be so, and not chronologically. A law, to be universal, must be

shown to be without exceptions. A single exception invalidates its universal application. And if a law is demonstrated to be not of universal application, it ceases to be a rule to be relied upon in the settlement of doubtful questions. This is the case with the argument under consideration. Some of the types which have been fulfilled, were not fulfilled chronologically. Consequently, those which remain to be fulfilled, may not be chronologically fulfilled. This will be seen more clearly by examining

THE TRUE CHRONOLOGICAL ARGUMENT WHICH IS CONTAINED  
IN THE TYPES.

We find that there were various observances under the Mosaic law, which were shadows of good *things* to come, and we suppose that they must be all antitypically fulfilled under the Christian dispensation; but the point of interest, is, how far they are, or are not, to be *chronologically* fulfilled. We find at Christ's first Advent, a portion of the types were fulfilled as to *time*. Another portion of them were fulfilled, but *not* as to time. The killing of the paschal lamb on the 14th of *Abib*, was chronologically fulfilled by the crucifixion of our Savior the same day; and so was the offering of the first fruits on the morrow after the Sabbath of the paschal week, by his resurrection, the first fruits of those that slept. As God has thus observed *times* in the fulfillment of those types, no man can deny but those which are unfulfilled may be fulfilled in their time. But there were other types which were not thus fulfilled; and therefore it is not necessary that they should be fulfilled chronologically. The goat for the sin offering, which was slain on the tenth day of the seventh month, was fulfilled in the death of Christ the 14th day of the first month; and the scape-goat, on which was laid the sins of the people, and led away into the wilderness the same day, was fulfilled in Christ about the 1st of the eleventh month, when the Spirit led him away into the wilderness, immediately after his baptism; and when John next beheld him he exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." The high priest also entered the holy of holies on the tenth day of the seventh month; but our High Priest entered the holiest of all in the third month, when he ascended into heaven itself, and sat himself at the Father's right hand, to make atonement for the sins of the

world. We also find that some of the types, which can only be fulfilled at his second Advent, had their observances at one season of the year ; while others, which shadow forth the same event, were observed at other seasons of the year. The feast of the wheat harvest, a type of the resurrection of the righteous, was in the third month ; the coming of the high priest out of the holiest of all to bless the waiting congregation, was in the seventh month ; the coming of the children of Israel out of Egypt, the passing over them by the destroying angel, and the slaying of the Egyptians, were all in the first month ; the blowing of the Jubilee trumpet, and the deliverance of captives, were also in the seventh month. As, therefore, the types which shadow forth the second Advent were observed on different days, they cannot all be fulfilled chronologically ; and, if it is not necessary that all should be thus fulfilled, it may not be that any must ; or, we cannot tell which day should be thus distinguished. And as some of the types of Christ's first Advent were fulfilled on days which were honored by the observance of other types, and others—the leading the scape goat into the wilderness, and the entering of the high priest into the holy of holies,—were fulfilled on days which had been honored by no observances ; if we reason by analogy, and judge of the future by the past, they leave us entirely in the dark as to the day which will be honored by the Advent of the Lord. And, therefore, we need to watch continually, in obedience to our Savior's commands, to live with our loins girt about and our lights burning, to live in daily and constant expectation of his glorious appearing. And while we are thus daily looking, if we should continue here, as it may please God to have us, for the trial of our faith, until the anniversary of those days which were chosen of God, and set apart for the observance of the rites of the Mosaic law, we may look to them with peculiar interest ; and to those feasts which have never been honored by an antitypical fulfillment, we may look with still greater assurance ; and yet it cannot be shown but that any day may witness the coming of the Lord.

#### THE TERMINATION OF THE PROPHETIC PERIODS.

In the previous part of this article it was shown, that to complete the prophetic periods, it would be necessary to ex-

tend them as far into A.D. 1844 as they respectively commenced after the beginning of the respective years B.C. from which they were dated ; and as we had no clue to the time in those respective years when the several events transpired from which the prophetic periods have been reckoned, it would be necessary for A. D.<sup>o</sup> 1844 to expire, to disprove our dates for their commencement, or the accuracy of the chronologies, by which we have been guided. That year has now expired. We have consequently now reached a point of time to which none of the prophetic periods can be extended, if time has been correctly marked, and our dates for their commencement were correct. We must therefore acknowledge that we were either premature in those dates, or that human chronology is not perfectly accurate. In arriving at our chronological conclusions, we have followed those chronologies which have been considered as the most authentic. There is however a disagreement among the several chronologers respecting the dates of the several events from which we have reckoned the prophetic periods ; but which is all harmonized within the circle of a few years. Those chronologers which we have followed have placed the date of the respective events at the earliest point within this circle. But as other chronologers have assigned to them a later point of time, we are justly entitled to all the time which is in dispute among them, before our position can in any way be materially affected, or its chronological bearings tested.

The seven times, or 2520 years of the Jewish subversion, we have always dated from the captivity of Manassah. This captivity is placed in B. C. 677, or the year 4037 of the Julian Period, in the 22d year of Manasseh's reign, by Dr. Prideaux, Archbishop Usher, Jackson, Playfair, Blair and others ; Guthrie, Horne, and Calmet date it B. C. 676, Dr. Hales, B. C. 675, (as the Jews in *Seder Olam Rabba*, and the Talmudists, date it. See *Ganz*, p. 45,) and Dr. Jarvis, B.C. 674.

We reckon the 2450 years of the Great Jubilee from the captivity of Jehoiakim in the fourth year of his reign. This is dated B. C. 607, by Ptolemy Petavius, Usher, &c. ; but Playfair, Whiston, Prideaux, and others date it from B.C. 606 ; while Berosus, Blair, Jackson and Dr. Hales date it in B. C. 605.

The 2300 days we begin at the commencement of the 70 weeks, at the going forth of the decree to restore and build Jerusalem, in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes

Longimanus. B. C. 457, is assigned as the date of this decree, by Blair, Prideaux, Ferguson, Horne, Watson, Plotemy, and the great majority of commentators. Other chronologers reckon the 70 weeks from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. Usher, Petavius, and others thus reckon, and date from the year 4260 of the Julian Period, or B. C. 454. Hengstenberg dates it and reckons from B. C. 455.

The "seven weeks, and the sixty and two weeks," or 69 weeks to the commencement of Christ's ministry, terminated, according to our chronology, A. D. 27, at Christ's baptism. In this we were sustained by Dr. Hales and others; but Prideaux, Ferguson, and others, who terminate the 69 weeks in A. D. 26, contend that they terminated with the baptism of John, and that our Savior was not baptized till three years later; while Usher, Petavius, Hengstenberg, Lydyiat, and others, extend the sixty-nine weeks to A. D. 29 or 30.

The crucifixion of our Savior is dated in the years 31, 32, 33, and 34, from the vulgar era, by different chronologists.—Dr. Hales contends that it was A. D. 31; while Sir Isaac Newton argues that it was in A. D. 34. Scaliger, Usher, Pearson, Bacon, and others argue that it was in A. D. 33. Ferguson, Prideaux, Bullinger, Blair and others, terminate the 70 weeks at the crucifixion; while Lydyiat, Usher, Petavius, and others, extend them three and a half years beyond.

It will be seen by the above that there is a disagreement among chronologers respecting the dates of the events from which we have severally reckoned the prophetic periods. And yet that disagreement is all within a circle of a very few years. It will be also seen, that reckoning any of the prophetic periods from the latest dates which are assigned by any standard chronologers for the events from which we have reckoned them, they cannot be extended beyond A. D. 1847; while there are intermediate points between the present and that year, where they would terminate, if reckoned from other given dates. As this ground is "disputed territory," and as there are chronologers of note, which, if followed in their dates, would terminate the several periods at various points within this disputed circle, we are certainly entitled to all the time thus in dispute, before it can be proved that our chronology, or the several events from which we have reckoned, are incorrect. We have followed those chronologers, which are admitted to be the most authentic, and have adopted



those dates which are considered to be the best sustained.—It is now proved that those which we have followed are not perfectly accurate ; and while there is a variation from perfect accuracy, it cannot be shown whether that variation is one day, one year, more, or less ; nor can it be shown which of the several chronologers within the disputed circle, who in any way vary from the ones we have followed, are the most accurate. The dates of others may be as much too late, as those we have followed have been too early. It will, therefore, be time enough to look to them when all the intervening time shall have expired. And the authority, on which such are predicated, is far more questionable than that on which we have relied. While, therefore, we are satisfied that the truth is among the chronologers referred to, we are unable to decide which of them presents the best evidence of its possession.

#### OUR POSITION

Is therefore the same as that presented in the last number of the Shield, in the article under that head. We regard this as a period of time in which we are emphatically to take heed to ourselves lest at any time our hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon us unawares. Our position is one of continual and confident expectation. With no time which must necessarily intervene between the present and the time of the Lord's return—having run out all the prophetic periods, according to the chronologers we have followed respecting the date of the events from which we have reckoned—being at the *terminus* of all historical prophecy ; and occupying that point of time, to which the primitive church and the reformers looked, and which is designated by the signs of the times ; we may daily and hourly look for the coming of our King,—not knowing the day or the hour, or when the definite time is, and yet knowing that it is at the very door, that it cannot be long delayed, and may burst upon us at any moment. Thus we will continue to wait and watch, praying for, and loving his appearing, doing all we can for the preparation of our fellow-men for that event, yet willing to tarry here God's time until Salem's golden spires shall burst upon our vision, and we shall enter upon eternal realities.

B.

# THE REVIEW.

---

## EDITOR'S TABLE.

Boston, January, 1845.

**DELAY OF THIS NO. OF THE SHIELD.**—It was intended that the present number of the Shield should have been ready for our readers, the 1st of September last. It has, however, been unavoidably delayed until the present time. This work is not designed to be a Quarterly periodical; and it is only published as it seems to be needed. On account of our views respecting the seventh month, we suspended, for the time, all our publications. That was the principal cause of the delay of this No. If time should continue, another No. may be expected about the time of anniversary week.

---

### NEW PUBLICATIONS.

“**QUESTIONS ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL**, *designed for Bible students, in the Sabbath School, in the Bible class, and at the fire-side.*” BOSTON. Published By J. V. Himes, 14 Devonshire Street. Price 12 1-2 cents.

This is a neat little bound volume of 80 pages, to which the following is the preface :—

The design of this work is to simplify the “Book of Daniel,” by appropriate questions on the letter of the text, and the subjects it presents; which are illustrated by a comparison of its various parts with other scriptures, as well as by historical and other explanations, that show the fulfillment of the various predictions therein contained.

Much more might have been introduced in illustration of the details of the prophecy; but it was admissible, in a work of this kind, only to bring to view the great truths which Daniel was commissioned to present to mankind, in reference to the succession of the four dominant powers which were to have the supremacy in the earth, and the great events in the history of the church and the world, which were to precede the establishment of God's everlasting kingdom under the whole heaven, when the great plan of redemption will have been consummated. We are aware that the great body of our friends are familiar with these truths; but it has been thought best, in accordance with the wishes of many, to present them in this form, for the purpose of extending the knowledge of our views to others,—our children and friends especially,—while time and opportunity may be offered. And thus we shall obey the command of God by Moses, to teach his words diligently unto our children, to talk of them when we sit in the house, when we walk by the way, when we lie down, and when we rise up. See Deut. vi. 7.

N. B. It will be seen that the answers to most of the questions are

contained in the text to which they are appended ; while others are answered in full. — The historical and other explanations are from the most authentic sources.

---

THE ADVENT MESSAGE, to the Daughters of Zion. No. 2. BOSTON.

Published by J. V. Himes. Price 10 cents.

This is an 8vo pamphlet of 24 pages, of original articles relating to the Advent faith, and Christ's Second coming, from the pens of several of the best female writers of this faith. It is designed to advance the cause among the women of our land. The merits of this number fully sustains the character of the preceding one.

---

SUPPLEMENT TO THE ADVENT HERALD of Dec. 4th, 1844.

This is a large 8vo pamphlet of 32 pages, containing an "Address to the Public," an "Address to Adventists," and an "Address to our Opponents." The design of the Address to the Public is to vindicate the course of the Adventists, and to show that their views of Prophetic Time and the Historical Prophecies are sustained by the best commentators, and the voice of the Church in all ages. The Address to Adventists, is designed to encourage them in their faith by the evidence of the similarity of their views and condition, compared with the Church in the days of the apostles. And the design of the Address to the Opposers of our Hope, is to show that they have failed to disprove any of the great prophetic landmarks on which we rely, that their views are severally contradictory to those of each other, that there is no essential feature in the views of Adventists, but what is admitted by the different writers, who oppose them,—each admitting some one or more points,—and that the faith of Adventists is that once delivered to the saints. Price 12 1-2 cents.

---

"ANASTASIS, Or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, rationally and scripturally considered,—By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York city University—New York and London: Wiley and Putnam, 1845.

This work of about 400 pages, designed to show that "the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine of revelation," has been kindly furnished us by the author. It is written in an attractive manner—in the author's own peculiar style—and presents all the various objections which can be philosophically urged against the doctrine of a literal resurrection, with a critical examination of the several scriptures which are usually adduced in support of that doctrine.

This is a question of much interest at the present time, and is in our opinion the only alternative to which the churches can resort to avoid the conclusion of a literal reign of Christ on earth. The doctrines of the pre-millennial personal Advent, the physical regeneration of the earth after

being melted with literal fire, the personal reign of Christ on earth, and the inheritance of the saints in the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, are so intimately connected and blended together, that if any of them are Scriptural, all are. While, therefore, any admit a final resurrection of the body, they cannot consistently deny either of the other doctrines. We feel that the time has now come when Christians must take a position on this question, and avow to the world, to which side they lean.

While Prof. Bush displays much ingenuity, learning and research, and has written in the kindest manner, we must acknowledge, that we find nothing in his reasonings to weaken our confidence in the common acceptance of those texts upon which the doctrine of the resurrection is based; and we can find nothing in the argument from "reason" to set aside positive declarations—God's ability being sufficient to surmount all obstacles in the fulfillment of his word. The principal arguments, with a review of them, may be expected in the *Advent Herald*.

We believe that Prof. Bush's views of the resurrection will be regarded with much favor by the churches. And we find that those who condemn them in *toto*, if we ask them to define *their views*, usually deny the *materiality* of the resurrection; so that we are unable to perceive the shades of difference between his views and their own. For sale by the booksellers generally.

---

"NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM OF THE GREAT IMAGE. No. 2. By George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University." Press of Harper and Brothers, Cliff St., New York, 1844. Price 25 cents.

We have received a copy of the above No. by the politeness of the author, who gives in it a critical analysis of each text as he proceeds, in connection with the original Chaldee, the Greek of Theodotian and the Vulgate versions, in connection with the common English version. This is a work of rare ability, displaying great research and much critical acumen. The author sustains us fully until we come down to the fifth kingdom, which he places in the present state of the world, but under a highly perfected state of things which he supposes will continue forever. This is the ground which all will finally be obliged to take, who persist in denying the personal Advent of Christ. If there is such an event ever to take place, it must be in this age of the world. Those who defer it far in the future, must be driven to a denial that it will ever occur. There is no middle ground. There is no other alternative.

The work before us endeavors to show that the breaking of the image by the stone is a very gradual work; but we are unable to see the force of the argument for such a conclusion.



# THE ADVENT SHIELD AND REVIEW.



THIS work will be continued as the cause we advocate shall demand it. Notice will be duly given in our papers when another number will be issued.

---

## AGENCIES.

The SHIELD may be obtained at 14 Devonshire Street Boston; 9 Spruce Street, New York, by addressing J. V. HIMES; 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia, Pa. J. Litch; Rochester, New York, 17 Arcade, G. S. Macomber.

The SHIELD will be sent, by *Mail*, to any part of the United States, when ordered. To Postmasters, or others who remit ONE DOLLAR, free of expense, we will send THREE copies. Single copies at 37½ cents.

---

## SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

Of every description, can be procured either at 14 Devonshire-street, Boston; 9 Spruce-st, New York, or 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia. J. V. HIMES.

---

POSTAGE.—Six Sheets—under 100 miles, 9 cts.—over 100 miles, 15 cts.

---

DOW & JACKSON'S POWER PRESS, 14 DEVONSHIRE ST. BOSTON

THE  
ADVENT SHIELD,  
AND  
REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1845.  
VOLUME I.—NUMBER 3.

---

CONTENTS.

| PAGE.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | PAGE.                                                                                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ART. XV.—The Doctrine of the Resurrection Vindicated—A Review of "Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body rationally and Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University." 289 | ART. XVI.—The Conflagration of the Heavens and Earth—A Review of "The Millennium and New Jerusalem, by George Bush." 423 |

EDITED BY  
J. V. HIMES, S. BLISS, & A. HALE.

Boston :  
PUBLISHED BY J. V. HIMES,  
No. 14 DEVONSHIRE STREET.

~~~~~  
DOW AND JACKSON....PRINTERS.

THE ADVENT SHIELD.

ARTICLE XV.

The Doctrine of the Resurrection Vindicated.—A Review of "Anastasis,—or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, Rationally and Scripturally considered, by George Bush, Professor of Hebrew, New York City University."

BY S. BLISS.

THE doctrine of the resurrection has ever, since the resurrection of Christ, been regarded as a most vital question in connection with the Christian's Faith. The death and resurrection of Christ are the foundation of the Christian's Hope. As Christ burst the bonds of death and rose triumphant from the tomb, so we are encouraged to hope, that through his resurrection, "death will be swallowed up in victory." The subject and nature of the resurrection cannot, therefore, be uninteresting to any lover of inspired truth.

Upon the nature of the resurrection depends, in a great measure, as we conceive, the nature of all the events which are to transpire at the commencement of the millennial age. If the resurrection of the dead is only a spiritual elimination from the body at death, as Prof. Bush teaches, it will necessarily follow that Christ's second advent, the end of the world, the New Heavens and New Earth, and the reign of Christ on earth, must all be of a nature to correspond. But on the other hand, if there is a "resurrection of the body," it must necessarily follow that these corresponding events will be *literally* fulfilled. The whole question is therefore decided by a decision of the question respecting the *nature* of the resurrection. And as the work under review has struck deep at the foundation,—at this "Corner Stone" of our hope, we

have regarded it as a question of sufficient interest and importance, to bestow upon it a candid and prayerful examination.

That we are in "the very crisis of this world's history," Prof. Bush, in a previous work, has admitted; and also that "if we take the ground of right reason, we must believe that the present age is one expressly foretold in prophecy, and that *it is just opening upon the crowning consummation of all prophetic declarations.*" The nature of the events to transpire at this "crowning consummation," is the only question here at issue: and on the nature of the resurrection all these turn. Says Prof. Bush:—

"The resurrection of the body, if my reasonings and expositions are well-founded, is not a doctrine of revelation."—*Preface.*

We therefore propose to examine the soundness of his "reasonings," and the correctness of his "expositions." The first proposition of the author, as laid down in his "introduction," is that

"THE KNOWLEDGE OF REVELATION IS PROGRESSIVE."

In support of this, he argues, that as a knowledge of the "volume of *Nature*" is only acquired by slow and toilsome steps, and gradual developments are continually being made; so in "the volume of Revelation," there may be continually new discoveries, and new and unexpected views of truth, which may lead to the most momentous results. He gives, as the views entertained by the mass of Christians, that as our knowledge is continually being extended respecting the minute details of any country after we are familiar with its great outline, so they admit there is "the possibility of a greater amount of information as to the *particulars* of revealed truth—the clearing up of certain verbal difficulties and obscurities in the sacred text—and the happier illustration of certain passages from the manners and usages of Oriental life—while at the same time we no more look for any farther grand and momentous disclosures, than we do for the discovery of a third continent of equal dimensions with the eastern or western." p. 15. While he admits there is "a substantial truth involved in this view," he claims there are many things in the scriptures which will "receive a vastly fuller and clearer exposi-

tion, than has yet been afforded to the world ;" and that this progress will "modify, and in some cases, perhaps, supersede established ideas."

In proof of this, he adduces the intricacies and obscurities of some portions of scripture for which we sigh "for some Daniel, some dissolver of doubts and shower of hard sentences to unriddle," which are more particularly applicable to the "prophetical writings," but not confined to them, although he says, "all matters of *vital* importance are distinguished by a sun-like lucidness." He refers to "the drapery of a foreign and dead language," in which "the volume of revelation comes to us clothed," "the means of understanding" which "are constantly multiplying upon us ;" and also to "the signal advances which have been made in later times in the principles of biblical interpretation." These obscurities, he claims are "to be understood ;" and that while "there exists a deep-rooted impression" that we "have to do" only "with the *plainer* parts of revelation," and "the epithets of *fanciful, chimerical, visionary*," are associated "with any attempt, however sober, to pierce the veil of futurity," so that "hundreds of inquiring spirits have been frowned and frightened away from this field of inquiry by the force of prejudices wholly baseless and unreasonable," yet God is saying to us, "Come, and let us reason together."

We would not particularly dissent from the foregoing view of the question within certain limitations. We believe that light is being continually diffused over the sacred page, and that such light will shine with more and more distinctness unto the "perfect day." But we contend that such light will *always* be in accordance with the literal and grammatical reading of the inspired word, in the sense in which its language was used and understood in the times in which it was written :—always excepting such figurative and symbolical portions as the Bible itself explains. We can therefore not subscribe to a principle like the following. Says the Prof. :—

"If, for instance, the obvious, literal, and grammatical sense of the sacred record leads me to believe that the material globe, with the various orders of its inhabitants, was first spoken into existence six thousand years ago ; and geology at the same time brings to my mind absolute demonstrations, which I cannot possibly resist without doing violence to the fundamental laws of belief, that it has existed thousands and myriads of years before that time, what am I to think ? I am brought to a stand at once. I must pause and ponder on the discrepancy. I must cast about for some adequate mode of harmonizing these various views."—p. 26.

It is true that such discordant views need to be harmonized. But we could be at no "stand" *how* that should be done. If the "*obvious literal and grammatical sense of the sacred record,*" should give 6000 years for this world's age, we must abide by it, whatever *inferences* from *geological facts* might be presented to the *contrary*. A "thus saith the Lord," is better to us than the most scientific results from mere *human reasoning*. But does the Prof. inquire what we would do with these "geological facts?" We reply that we would admit fully the *facts*, but we would question the soundness of any *inferences* from those facts, which should deny a positive revelation. We remember that while God is infinite and knoweth all things, and therefore cannot be mistaken respecting any physical or moral truth, that man, in his best estate, in his most *scientific* and *philosophic*, is ever liable to the grossest errors.

We are uninformed what mighty and stupendous agencies were at work, actuated by the word of God, during the six days of creation, to change this earth from a chaotic to its Eden state, and which could have so stamped its entire geological structure, that finite beings might reason therefrom, that the book of nature contradicts the book of revelation. Nor are we acquainted with the extent of the changes which were wrought on the surface, or in the internal structure of the earth during the deluge, when the fountains (foundations) of the great deep were broken up. Therefore, when we find a "geological fact" which we cannot harmonize with a duration of only 6000 years for this world's existence, however demonstrative such fact may *seem* to be, we must ascribe our inability, not to any want of definiteness in the grammatical, obvious and literal sense of God's word, but to our own want of knowledge respecting the *cause* of these geological facts; and which, from the nature of the case, man has no means of penetrating.

We remember that *some inferences* from geological facts have been afterwards entirely disproved. Thus when Brydone discovered seven different strata of lava with two feet of soil between, in digging at the foot of Mt. Etna, and therefore concluded that, as no soil had accumulated on a bed of lava which he supposed was thrown out by an eruption of Etna mentioned by Polybius nearly 1700 years previously, it proved that more than 6000 years would be necessary to form layers of earth between those seven strata. This was thought

by many to be a conclusive argument ; and not being able to reconcile it with revelation, such "were brought to a stand at once," and in "casting about them" for a mode to harmonize the "discrepancy," they rejected the revelation as being disproved by geology. But it was afterwards ascertained that there have been discovered *six* different strata of lava at Herculaneum and Pompeii, with two feet of soil between each, when the first eruption which overwhelmed those cities was only 1700 years ago ; and if two feet of soil could accumulate between *six* layers of lava in 1700 years, it might *possibly* between *seven* in 6000. Thus the *inference* drawn from the first "*fact*" was shown to be fallacious, as *all* such *inferences* might be, if we could ascertain the cause of,—the manner of producing—and the length of time requisite for existing geological formations to be produced.

"THE ARGUMENT FROM REASON."

Under this head, are presented his first arguments against the resurrection of the body. He claims that "we must *understand* a proposition in order to *believe* it,"—not "the *mode* in which the asserted fact exists, but the *verbal proposition* affirming it ;" and that we "must be able to affix an intelligible sense to the language employed for that purpose." He says :—

"The simple assertion that the dead body is to be raised, does not constitute an intelligible proposition, for the reason that it leaves it utterly uncertain *what body is meant*. A resurrection is indeed predicated of a body, but this is a very different thing from the resurrection of *the* body, and our inquiry cannot possibly be satisfied, without a more minute specification." —p. 36.

He then argues, as the "constituent particles" of the body are continually varying, that no man has the same body now, he had seven years ago ; and that the man, who dies at seventy, has had ten different bodies ; and, "which of these is to be the body of the resurrection ?"

This philosophical consideration cannot militate against an understanding of "the simple assertion that the dead body is to be raised : " for if "*the dead body*" is to be raised, it must be "*the body*" that is "dead." There is no more necessity for supposing the *previous* bodies a man may have inhabited, were included, than there is for supposing, when a man's tenth

child dies, and it is said the child is dead, that the nine elder children died with it! And it would be just as *philosophical* to inquire which of the man's ten bodies *died*, or which of the ten was enclosed in the coffin, as it would to inquire which of the ten would be resurrected.

Again he asks :—

“ Or is it the aggregate of all these ! ” and adds, “ If we go back to the days of the Antediluvians, and apportion the number of the bodies of Methusaleh, for instance, to the length of his life, and then suppose the whole to be collected into one vast corporiety, we should indeed be reminded that as ‘ there were giants in those days,’ so there will be giants in the resurrection ! ”—p. 37.

This objection is only founded upon the *supposition*, that in the resurrection all those bodies, if collected, must be of the same *density* as in this life ; or that it would be inconsistent for there to be giants in the resurrection. But as it may be seen, that the question of which body will be raised, is only an imaginary difficulty, the other difficulties vanish with it.

Again he says :—

“ The resurrection body is to be a *spiritual*, and not a material body. The re-assemblage of material particles can result only in the reconstruction of a material body, and a material body cannot be at the same time spiritual ; at least we may confidently affirm that the *same material* body cannot be at the same time *spiritual*, although we are aware that Paul's expression ‘ a spiritual body,’ is understood by some to denote a body *adapted to spiritual uses*, instead of implying one that is metaphysically *spiritual* in contradistinction from *material*. But, taken in either sense, the assertion above quoted involves contradictory ideas. A material body is a body of flesh and blood ; but flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” p. 40.

Here is presented the supposed scriptural evidence of the *immateriality* of the resurrected body : it is to be a “ *spiritual* body,” and “ flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” Now if this last quotation proves that those who “ inherit the kingdom of God ” will possess immaterial bodies, it must certainly prove that this “ kingdom ” cannot be set up while men inhabit bodies of flesh and blood ; and Prof. Bush acknowledges we are in the age of the world when this kingdom is to be consummated. It can, therefore, be inherited by none save those who have passed their last change. Will the Professor explain how a kingdom which flesh and blood cannot inherit, can be set up in a world inhabited only by flesh and blood ?

Now we do not believe that “ flesh and blood ” will inherit this kingdom : and this text is one proof that this kingdom will

not be set up till Christ shall "judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing and kingdom." The objection to the materiality of the resurrected body, consists in supposing that a "*spiritual* body" cannot be a *material* body; and also, that if that which is committed to the tomb is raised, it must necessarily be a body of "*flesh and blood*."

1. That a *spiritual* body cannot be a *material* body. This objection is founded upon the supposition that a *spiritual body* must be an *ethereal* body, or, no body at all. That which is not material, can fill no space. A pure spirit, aside from all materiality, can have no body of any kind. A body must be composed of *matter*, however rarified, spiritualized, or *etherialized* it may be, and must occupy a certain space. If a spirit possess a *spiritual body*, it must possess something in addition to the spirit itself; but if the body is *spirit*, it is no addition to the spirit; so that the spirit is still destitute of a body. A *spiritual body* must therefore be something besides spirit, in which the spirit is "clothed upon;" and consequently must be a *material*, and not an *ethereal* body. There is no more necessity for supposing a *spiritual* body is nothing but spirit, than there is in supposing an intellectual man is nothing but intellect. Now, as the Prof. says he "must *understand* a proposition in order to *believe* it," we would ask him to explain to our "understanding" how a spirit can possess a "*spiritual body*," which is itself *spirit*?

But Paul informs us, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a *spiritual* body." What is raised a *spiritual* body? Why, evidently, that which is sown; i. e., that which is planted must be "raised." If nothing which is committed to the tomb is to form a part of the *spiritual* body, then there is no connection between what is "sown," and what is "raised," as our text assures us there is. And if that which is sown is raised, this "*spiritual body*" is also a *material* body, but "*adapted to spiritual uses*." The text also shows, that the body is spoken of as "*spiritual*" only as the converse of "*natural*," and not of *material*—the same as *it* is sown in *dishonor* and raised in *glory*. Again we would inquire, if it is an "intelligible idea," that what is sown is raised, and yet that there is no possible relation between the two bodies?

Paul however informs us, that *it*, that which is sown, is "*raised*" a *spiritual* body. To *resurrect* a body, it must have fallen from an *erect* attitude; it is the rising again of what has fallen, to its original and previous position. If all

which is laid aside at death, is forever to remain disconnected with the spiritual body, there can be no *resurrection*; for there is no rising again of that which is laid down. The "spiritual body," as Prof. Bush understands it, has never fallen, has no connection with what was deposited in the tomb: such would be a mere change of existence,—not a resurrection, but a new creation; and we would inquire how the "idea" of *such* a resurrection can be made "intelligible?" But as there is to be a resurrection, that which is fallen must be raised. Consequently the spiritual body must be the resurrection of the material body which was "sown," raised in "glory" and "power," "incorruptible" and "immortal."

2. But again we are told, that if the body that is sown, is raised, it will be a body of "flesh and blood," which "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." And even Prof. Bush asks:—

"Why shall preference be given to these particular bodies, when, as is well known, they are often withered and wasted by consumptions, swollen by dropsies, mangled by wounds, made hideous by deformities, curtailed of limbs, or become partially putrid by gangrenes? If the material particles are to be re-assembled at all, why not rather suppose that it will be those which composed it in the period of its prime, in its utmost vigor and beauty?"—p. 40.

Now the answer to all this is very simple; and we cannot but fancy those questions were asked without noticing the scriptural assurance, that "we shall all be *changed*." "Ye do greatly err," said our Savior in answering objections to the resurrection state, "not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God." If there was not to be this *change*, the bodies of the risen saints would be just as "wasted," "withered," "swollen," "mangled," "wounded," "hideous," "deformed," "curtailed," or "putrid," as when deposited in the earth. But all this is the result of the curse; and when there is "no more curse," men will have recovered what was lost by the "fall." "So," Paul assures us, "is also the resurrection of the dead. *It* is sown in corruption, *it* is raised in incorruption. *It* is sown in dishonor; *it* is raised in glory. *It* is sown in weakness; *it* is raised in power. *It* is sown a natural body; *it* is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." Such is Paul's testimony and explanation of this supposed objection. That it is a *mystery*, he admits, but he does not on that account reject it; and he adds that "at the last trump," "the dead," not a spiritual body which *never died*, but "the *dead* shall be raised, incorruptible, and we shall be changed: for this *corruptible*

must put on *incorruption*, and this mortal must put on immortality." Consequently when this change shall have taken place in accordance with "the scriptures" and "the power of God," that which was "putrid," "deformed," or "hideous," will have become "glorious," "incorruptible," and beautiful; and the body which was buried, "the flesh and blood," will be raised immortal and spiritual, but, nevertheless, to every intelligence, it will be "its own body."

Now it is a well established fact that all material creation is reducible to a few simple elements or different substances; and from these are constructed all the infinite variety of created matter, found in air, earth, or ocean. The atmosphere we breathe, with all its vapors and gases, the water we drink, and that which forms the mighty ocean, the earth itself with all its varieties of soils, rocks and minerals, all its varied productions, from the moss of Greenland, to the noble Banian tree of India, all the varieties of grass, herbs, shrubs and trees, with their varieties of fruits and flowers, their various and beautiful colors, the wondrous contrivances by which they are sustained and nourished, the infinite variety of animal life, from the smallest animalcule, to the leviathan of the deep, from the smallest moving thing that creepeth on the earth, to the mighty behemoth of the forest, from the smallest insect that floats on the breeze, to the noble eagle that soars in mid heaven, with all their constituent parts, their blood and bone and muscle, flesh and sinews, veins and arteries, their feathers, hair or scales, every organ of sense, and every property discoverable by feeling, sight or taste, with every medicinal or poisonous quality of matter; are all the results of the different combinations of these few simple elements. A slight variation or change in the proportions of their elements, or arrangement of the particles of which any substance is composed, often produces the most surprising results, forming new and different substances. In this way, that which is poisonous is often made wholesome and nutritious, and that which is harmless is by a like change rendered poisonous. Even the air we breathe, and on which we depend for the preservation of our animal existence, by a slight variation of the relative proportion of its constituent gases, becomes the most deadly enemy of life.

A perfect arrangement of all the material elements would present the perfection of beauty, health and utility in all created beings and things. Such was earth in its Eden state,

when God pronounced all things "very good," and the morning stars sang together for joy over a new made world. All this is now under the "curse," and all creation is *marred*: instead of beauty and perfection and health, we behold sickness and pain, disease, and death, and decay. But when another change shall have been effected, and the constituent elements of all creation are re-arranged and proportioned anew, then the wilderness will be again as Eden, and the desert as the garden of the Lord. Then, instead of corruption will be incorruption, and instead of mortality will be immortality: for all things will be made, or re-arranged anew. Then the "wasted," "withered," "swollen," "mangled," "wounded," "hideous," "deformed," "mutilated," or "putrid" corpses, which may have been cast aside by dying humanity, with such a change, would be no longer hideous or loathsome, but would be as lovely and angelic, as pure and inviting, as they were loathsome and repulsive.

But this change, Paul assures us, is a "mystery; and Professor Bush is bound by his own rule to reject it, because it is not "an intelligible idea." And he is also by the same rule obliged to reject every chemical or physiological change or result, because, although the result is evident, yet the why and wherefore such result is produced, can be only a "mystery." He must even deny the growth of vegetables, because we cannot understand *how* their growth is effected, and Professor Bush says, "we must *understand* a proposition before we can believe it." But is it replied that this is not analogous? that we have seen these results produced and therefore can believe them? We answer, that the philosophy of these results is none the less incomprehensible; and that is the objection urged against the resurrection of the body. The great question which Paul predicted "some man will say," is "How are the *dead* raised up," not a spiritual body which emerged from the dead body at death and which was never dead, but "How are the *dead* raised up? and with what *body* do *they* come?" And he assures us that that which is "quickened" must previously "die." But when it is quickened, then the result will be as evident, as if the change was not a "mystery." "Flesh and blood" are the result of a certain combination, and the arrangement of a few of these elements. Re-arrange or change the arrangement of these particles, and while the body is the same, it is no longer "flesh and blood." The "flesh" is the result of one combination,

and the "blood," of another ; add to the flesh, and mingle with its elements some of the properties of the "blood," and it would be no longer flesh, but a new substance ; or mingle with the "blood" some of the properties of the "flesh," and it would be no longer blood. And thus the whole man, when quickened, will not be "flesh and blood," but a glorified body.

Dr. Nelson thus illustrates this.

"God can make very durable and very glorious things, out of materials the very opposite of firmness, or of brilliancy. He has done this. Of all the substances with which we are acquainted, we esteem the *diamond* the hardest, and the most glittering. Charcoal is as black and as crumbling as any other body known to us ; yet these two bodies are the *same* ! The learned know, the plough-boy does not, that the difference between charcoal and diamond is, that the Creator has ordered a *different arrangement of particles* ! The same materials are differently placed, that is all. If any are wishing for a body more beautiful than they now have, they may be assured that God can, if he chooses, take a part of our present fragile, corruptible forms of clay, and make of it something exceedingly glorious. 'It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory.'"—(*Cause and Cure of Infidelity*, p.71.)

The *change* in the arrangement of the particles in the *charcoal* to produce a *diamond*, is no less wonderful, or mysterious, or "unintelligible," than will be the change in our material bodies ; and if Professor Bush is constrained to reject the one as an "unintelligible proposition," to be consistent with himself and his own rule, he must reject the other.

We thus learn that the body of "flesh and blood," which is laid aside at death, when it shall be quickened in the resurrection, will not then be necessarily a body of flesh and blood. We have also seen that a spiritual body is not necessarily an immaterial body. But to ascertain the true nature of the future spiritual bodies of the saints, we can only have recourse to the Scriptures, to the positive declarations of God's word. A question of this nature depends in a great measure upon the definition of terms. And as we have no dictionary of these, or any umpire to whom we can refer for their definition, we can only refer to the Scriptures themselves. It is however fortunate that the Bible is its own *glossary* : it contains within itself the definition of its own terms. And we find that the term *spiritual* is, in some instan-

ces, there applied by the Holy Spirit to *material* substances. Thus God, speaking by Hosea, vii. 7, says, that "the spiritual *man* is mad." That cannot surely refer to an *etherial* man. Paul, Rom. vii. 14, uses spiritual in opposition to carnal; and in 1 Cor. ii. 13, he makes the same use of it. In several places he speaks of "spiritual things," &c., and he speaks of those who are spiritual.

We are, however, not entirely dependent upon the scriptural use of this term, for an understanding of what our spiritual bodies will be: God has in his Word revealed even this unto us. We are aware that Professor Bush has entered into an examination of the texts which are adduced in support of a material resurrection; but we will, nevertheless, in this connection refer to a few, which positively assert that the *bodies* which are dead will again be raised. In Ezek. xxxvii. 12, we read, "I will open your *graves*, and cause *you* to come up *out of your graves*." A spiritual body, as Professor Bush explains it, was never in the grave; but here the resurrection body is something to be taken out of the grave when it is opened. This cannot be figurative language, for it is God's explanation of a symbolic representation; and he never explains symbols, or figures, or parables, by language which needs another explanation to be understood. Again we read, Dan. xii. 2, "Them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." This must be a literal prediction, for the context is literal; but the material body is that alone which "sleeps in the dust of the earth." Consequently the material body will be raised." In Matt. xxvii. 52, we read, "And the *graves* were opened, and many *bodies of the saints which slept*, arose." Here it is positively asserted that the "*bodies of the saints which slept*," arose. This, according to any use of language, can express nothing but a *material* resurrection. Again, John v. 28, "*all that are in the graves shall come forth*," &c. This must imply something besides a body which was never dead. Paul, Acts xxiv. 15, had hope that there would be "a resurrection of the *dead*." The material body alone *dies*.

Again we read, Rom. viii. 11, "He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your *mortal bodies*." Here the assertion is *positive* that our mortal bodies, those we now inhabit, are the ones which will be quickened. We also read Phil. iii. 21, that God will "change our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body." And Isaiah,

xxvi. 19, assures us that the "*dead men*" of Zion, will arise with his "*dead body*," that those that " *dwell in the dust,*" will "*arise and sing,*" and that the "*earth shall cast out the dead.*" All these and kindred passages assert the resurrection of the body, as positively as language can assert any doctrine; and we cannot conceive how the "*idea*" can be made "*intelligible,*" that such language can be made applicable to a body which we receive at death, which never dies, and can never be raised from the dead. And that it cannot refer to such a body, is rendered evident, aside from all other considerations, from the fact that the wicked will not live till 1000 years after the resurrection of the righteous; whereas, if the resurrection of each body takes place at its death, as Professor Bush contends, no period of 1000 years could transpire, during which "*the rest of the dead live not again.*"

NEW COMBINATIONS OF THE PARTICLES COMPOSING THE
DEAD BODY BETWEEN DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.

This is the next great objection founded in "*reason*" against the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. "*Waving all objection*" respecting *spiritual* bodies, Professor Bush says:—

"The doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, in *any sense whatever*, encounters difficulties in our view absolutely insuperable, arising from the changes and new combinations which the particles of the dead body undergo in the interval between death and the resurrection. Who does not know that the luxuriant vigor and verdure of the wheat crops, waving over the field of Waterloo, are owing to a source of fertility which the Belgic husbandman never conveyed to the soil?

Rich harvests wave, where mighty Troy once stood,
Birth of a soil made fat with Phrygian blood.

The putrescent relics of the goodly structure which once enshrined a human soul, are resolved into the dust of the earth. The dust springs up in the varied forms of vegetable life. The beasts of the field crop the grasses and the herbs, which derive their succulence from the constituent material of the bodies of buried men. Out of these eaters comes forth sweetness, and the flesh which was fed by the flesh of the fathers, goes to the sustenance of the flesh of the sons. To whom shall these particles belong in the day of their final recall from these varied compositions? Will it not require the whole vegetable and animal world to be decomposed, in order to extricate the assimilated portions and give to each his due? And how can the matter ever be adjusted? The particles that now belong to one body have previously belonged to some other; whose shall they be in the resurrection?—as the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands. And what shall we say of the case of those who have fallen victims to the barbarous rage and horrid hankerings of cannibals? Who

shall be the rightful claimants in the day of adjudication, when specific particles have been incorporated into two different bodies!"—p. 41.

This objection is pursued at greater length, but the foregoing is "the sum of the matter." We are very much surprised that the Professor should inquire "whose" these supposed particles shall "be in the resurrection," and compare the question to the one "the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands!" for to us it appears *just about as pertinent*. Both are the results of not knowing,—to say nothing of the Scriptures—the mighty power of God. This reasoning at first view is very plausible, and many, by this objection alone, have been made to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. It will, however, we trust, be seen that it is only a *supposition*—merely a supposed difficulty, and that nothing is *proved* by it.

That the particles of matter composing our corporeal structures do at death enter into new and varied combinations, no intelligent person will deny; and that particles of matter which have entered into the structure of the father's body, *may* subsequently perform the same office in that of the son, will also be admitted. But, can it be *proved* that the *same particles of matter* have ever borne a relation to *two* human beings, so as the *second time* to compose a part of a human body at *death*—for this is an objection to the supposition that the body inhabited at death will be raised—so as to be liable to be claimed in the resurrection by two different persons? No. It will not for one moment be asserted that such a case *can* be made out. All the force, then, there is in the argument is that such *might* be the fact! That it *might* be, we admit, unless God has decreed otherwise. But if he has so decreed, he has the wisdom, skill and power to prevent it. We should not therefore, permit any such *supposition*, founded on "the oppositions of science, falsely so called,"—for all science is *false*, which contradicts the *true* meaning of the Scriptures—to militate against the express declarations of God's word.

But, is it asked, can it be *demonstrated* that such results will *not* be obstacles in the way of the resurrection of the body? We answer, No. We *cannot demonstrate* this, only as we show that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of such a resurrection: nor is it necessary that we should *prove a negative*. Before it can be a valid objection, the affirmative must be *proved*.

But, is it again asked, how can such results be *avoided*, in the production of the countless millions of beings, who have appeared and passed away from the stage of life? We answer, it can only be avoided by HIM who constructs and nourishes all the workmanship of his hands, and who arranges, according to his own wisdom and pleasure, all the various particles which enter into the combination of animate or inanimate objects. If God has purposed to raise again the identical bodies which are laid aside when the man is "unclothed" at death, he has the power, while arranging his "handy-work," so to order the disposition of the various constituent particles in all the various combinations of matter, that, whatever changes these particles may pass through, or offices they may subsequently perform, they shall, at the death of any person, have respectively composed a part of only *one* dead body; and so every body at death, may be composed of particles which were never the component parts of any previous dead body.

Thus, if the succulent properties of man's "putrescent relics" add "luxuriant vigor" to grasses, herbs, or waving crops; or even if these are eaten by the beasts of the field, however varied and changeful their combinations may be, if they never again enter the human structure, this objection falls powerless to the ground. Or if they again become "the constituent material of the bodies" of men, if the body only is to be raised which is put off at death, and having there performed their office, shall pass away into new combinations before death overtakes the subsequent body of which they were constituents, the objection is equally powerless. And that such *may* be the case, no one will deny, who limits not the power of the Almighty.

That there is a *necessity* that the same particles should fulfill the same office in the bodies of two persons, no philosophical mind will claim. If 6000 years are the prescribed limits of this world's career, and the 800,000,000 of persons who are now estimated to pass out of existence once in thirty years, should have passed off the stage every thirty years from the fall to the close of time, there would be but 200 times 800,000,000, or 160,000,000,000 of beings in all who could ever have existed on the earth. If this immense number had all existed on the earth at any one time, and were scattered equally over the land on this earth's surface, there would have been more than *fifty* square rods of land for each person. But

100,000,000,000 of inhabitants—considering that all descended from two first parents, and that the inhabitants on the globe at the end of 1656 years from creation were reduced to eight persons—is a fair estimate of the number of all the generations of men; and if they were all equally diffused over this earth's surface irrespective of land or water, there would be 200 square rods, or of land alone, 80 square rods to each human being. Then would not these several districts of eighty square rods respectively furnish a sufficiency of material for a single human body? This no one will deny, who reflects for a moment that the greater part of this earth's surface, not covered by water, has been covered over with forests of majestic trees, not eighty rods apart, nor of man's pigmy size, but towering towards heaven, and in close proximity with each other. And therefore it is no more impossible with God to keep the material of the bodies of one hundred thousand million—the number of all who have lived on the earth, and which is only a little more than one hundred times the number now alive—separate and distinct, than it is to sustain 800,000,000 now on the earth, distinct each from the other. If, therefore, God has willed to raise the dead bodies of his saints, he is not, on the dissolution of each human body, so destitute of materials with which to perform a similar office, or so destitute of creative energy, that he may not lay these particular particles aside to be no longer used till the resurrection; or he may at his pleasure arrange them as constituents of other combinations, and still *preserve* them for their own appointed place in that “auspicious morn.” We therefore find that we cannot rely with confidence upon this objection, and are again driven “to the law and the testimony:” if they speak not according to this word, *there is no* light in them.

An objection that Professor Bush urges to this, is the difficulty of finding the first proprietor. He conceives that

“A portion of matter, which once entered into the body of Goliath of Gath, may have found its way into the flesh of Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, from which it might be traced till lodged in the person of some dancing dervish of an eastern city, whirling about in as many angry gyrations as ever did Bucephalus himself, when attempted to be mounted by any one but his royal rider.”—p. 42.

We have not followed our author through all the “gyrations” he conceives these same particles may pass, which he carries on indefinitely; but we have shown the nature of the

objection. We however "conceive" that the "difficulty of finding the first proprietor" of these particles, *can* be solved by Him who numbers not only the hairs of our head, but the atoms in the universe; and who might, if he saw fit, call each individual atom by its own appropriate name, watch over each in all their multiform combinations and "gyrations," and at last restore each to its destined office. It is in vain for man to attempt to limit infinity.

RELATION BETWEEN THE BODY THAT DIES AND THE BODY
THAT IS RAISED.

"The objection," says Professor Bush, "which constitutes the burden of our present argument, obviously resolves itself into the difficulty of conceiving of any fixed *relation* between the body that dies, and the body that is raised."—p. 42.

"If a man retained precisely the same body unchanged from his natal to his dying day, the difficulty would not be so glaringly insurmountable; but even in that case, as the resurrection body is to be a spiritual body, it confounds our faculties to attempt to imagine of what use the former materials and fleshly particles are to be, in the formation of a purely spiritual body."—p. 43.

"Even admitting, as of course we must, that the power of God is competent to form bodies of the same external configuration, but of more glorious texture, and to unite disembodied souls with them, still the question forces itself upon us—What *relation* exists between the original, putrified, decomposed, and dissipated body, and the sublimated, glorious, incorruptible fabric, which is to succeed;—what the relation in virtue of which I can call such a body *mine*, and say, 'Behold *my* body raised from the tomb and animated anew?'"—pp. 43, 44.

"Guided by the mere *letter* of Scripture, it is common to hear mention made of the body's being raised from the grave at the sound of the last trumpet, and of its coming out of the tomb or the sepulchre in which it was interred. This we concede is Scripture language, and the simple use of the *ipsissima verba* of the Holy Spirit can never be a ground of censure towards any man who uses it with pure motives. Still we are at full liberty to inquire into its meaning, and to institute the most rigid comparison between the literal averments of holy writ, and the inevitable deductions of our reason founded upon the ascertained results of science. The sense, however, which we are constrained to put upon the *letter* of the sacred record may be different from that which is most natively obvious, and such as would never have occurred to us, but from an apparent conflict between the literal interpretation and the known facts, or irresistible inferences derived from other sources."—p. 45.

Does the Professor mean that the use of the letter of Scripture is with "pure motives" when its *letter* is disbelieved, and that to use it believing it, is to use it with impure motives?

But, if we have read aright, here is an assumption of the superiority of *reason* over the express declarations of revelation. Perhaps Professor Bush would have his own language inter-

preted by the same rule he interprets the language of inspiration, and have us reject the *letter* of *his* reasoning! And certainly no one has cause of complaint, when the same liberties are taken with his own language, that he takes with the language of the Scriptures. Should we take these liberties, we should argue that Professor Bush does not mean what he says. This, it would seem from the above quotation, is the liberty he takes with God's word: he *rejects it*, if it conflicts with "known facts or irresistible inferences derived from other sources." We are therefore constrained to believe he does not mean this. For when "reason" is so often defective, when what are supposed to be well "established facts" are so often disproved, and when "irresistible inferences" are so often irresistibly proved to be baseless conjectures, when new discoveries are continually reversing the deductions from previous researches, and the whole history of the race proves how liable the wisest men are to be mistaken, we cannot conceive how one who "yields to none in reverence for the Scriptures," should reject the *letter* of a "thus saith the Lord," for any *supposed* difficulty in reconciling it with "the oppositions of science." If we may so depart from the *letter* of these Scriptures, we may by the same rule reject the *letter* of any portion of the Bible, and in this way anything, or nothing, may be proved from the word of God as the fancies, or the "reason" of men may dictate. Even the Professor's evidence for "*spiritual* bodies" might thus be set aside. We have noticed that in the presentation of any new view, its advocates are the strictest adherents to the *letter* of Scripture, when it is supposed to favor them; but if it denies their assumptions, they are ready to put constructions upon it, which otherwise "would never have occurred" to them! Is not such an admission presumptive evidence of the unsoundness of any theory? The word of God is to us the last appeal. We may not at first arrive at the true meaning of a passage. But where it is admitted that the language of the Scriptures is simple and positive, and can only be set aside by rejecting the *letter* of the word, we consider our case is made out. That such is the fact respecting the resurrection of the body, the above quotation, unless we reject its literal sense, admits. We will, however, examine some of his arguments for rejecting the *letter* of these Scriptures. He says:

"Thousands and millions of human bodies, that were once deposited in graves, are not there now, and never will be again. Their tombs are cen-

otaphs or *empty monuments*, in every sense of the word. Where now are the tenants of hundreds of the cemeteries of Egypt, whose mummy-remains have been removed?" &c, "and it is affirmed that these bodies are to be raised out of their graves at the last day; how is it to be reconciled with the fact now adverted to?"—p. 45.

In answer to his question whether this is "a *valid* objection," we reply, that it is no where said in the Bible, that *every man* must be raised from a *grave* or tomb; and although the ashes of many have been thus scattered, yet the graves of millions of others have never been disturbed; and therefore it is none the less true,—because the sea will give up the dead which are therein, and the remains of others must be gathered from the places whither they are scattered,—that the graves will be opened, and the dead will come up out of their graves. Our Savior says, "all that are *in* their graves will come forth." Others will be gathered from their respective receptacles, which will apply to *all* who have never been *in* a grave. But again he asks:—

"What is meant by the resurrection of the body, and what the *relation* which the body that dies bears to the body that is raised?"

But we shall perhaps be referred to the analogies of the vegetable world, and be reminded of Paul's striking illustration drawn from the sown seed, and the up-springing plant, in which we are to recognize the most fitting emblem of the resurrection."—p. 50.

He admits the general force of this analogy, but thinks the subject is thus illustrated "*in a different way*" than is generally imagined. He argues that the new plant "arises from some inwrapped and latent germ or stamen, to which the vital principle of the plant adheres, and under the plastic and organic power of which the new plant is developed;" but that there is here "the uninterrupted continuance of *life*," with "no *break* in the chain of vital operation," so that "the *relation*" is obvious "which the new plant bears to the old," and "so long as we can keep our eye on the unbroken thread of life," "there is a consistent sense in which it is the same plant." But if a seed was *decomposed*, and a plant of the same nature should spring up in a distant place fifty years afterwards, we could conceive of no relation between the two. He then adds:—

"Now this presents very fairly the difficulty in regard to the resurrection of the body. The difficulty arises from the break in the continuity of the vital operations. While the body is *alive*, the vital functions are indissolubly connected with the presence and functions of the *soul*. When death takes place, the principle to which the *animation* of the body was owing, departs and leaves the body a mere mass of inert lifeless matter, subject, like all other matter, to the action of chemical agencies, by which

it is gradually resolved into its primitive elements. Where then do we, or can we, detect anything like a germ or staminal principle, by the action of which a new body can ever be developed out of the remains of the former!"—p. 51.

He then argues that a seed thrown into the fire, loses its reproductive power; and that the same effect would be produced on the vital principle of a human body if it were submitted to the action of the flames; so that "the same natural causes which forbid the re-quickening of the one, forbid that of the other also.

This is said on the hypothesis that there remains a vital principle in the human body. But as we have no belief in any such "vital principle," we have no disposition to meet that part of the objection. We believe with Professor Bush, that "If the body is again to be animated, it must be by the re-infusion of the soul." If there was a something remaining in the dead body by which it might germinate, as plants do, the demonstration of such a *break* would be a *valid* argument. But as we acknowledge no such principle, and look for no resurrection of the body by "*natural causes*," all the foregoing objections weigh nothing. The resurrection can only be produced by the miraculous power of Him who first made man,—not causing him to germinate by "natural causes" like a "plant," but by forming him out of "the dust of the earth," and breathing into him "the breath of life." Thus we behold Adam first formed out of the dust, before this life is breathed into him. There is no vital principle there; and the question might be asked, What "*relation*" can there be between this inanimate body, and the body of the future Adam after the breath of life shall be breathed into him? Upon the same principle may we inquire what relation there is between the body before it is raised, and the body after it is raised, when the life has been suspended? If the same spirit is again infused into the same body, no one will deny but that the body that died is raised, whether there is any "*relation*" or not between its two states of existence. The man is "unclothed," and he is again "clothed:" this tabernacle is put off and it is again put on: we are in this tabernacle, we leave it for a season, and then we enter it again: it is dissolved for a season, and it is refitted again. The relation which did exist is restored,—like the plant which grows for a season in a certain soil, is taken up and protected during the inclement winter, and is again set out in the same

place. The break in the relation between the soul and body, and that between the plant and garden, we conceive to be alike. So much for the *break* in the thread of life. But against this re-animation of the body, Professor Bush arrays two objections :—

1. "How is the body to be forthcoming at the appointed time, when it has become blended with an infinity of other organization, and when different human bodies have an equal claim to the particles composing it?"—p. 52.

This we have already answered in a previous part of the argument.

2. "Supposing that Omnipotence should adjust this difficulty, will the re-construction of the original materials of the fleshly body form the spiritual body which we conceive to be that of the resurrection? And if a change take place virtually equivalent to a new creation, how can this be termed the resurrection of the *same* body?"—p. 52.

The first question has been answered by showing that a spiritual body is not necessarily *im*-material. And the second question obviously should be answered in the affirmative. We take a house and separate every board, shingle and timber. It is no longer a house. We again bring them all together, each in the very place it previously occupied, and all so nicely adjusted that the house is perfect in every part. Would this be a new creation or a restoration? It would evidently be a restoration, a "resurrection" of the house; and yet the change may have been virtually equivalent to a new creation. Just so it is with the human body. If the *same* particles which once constituted any single body, have been scattered to the four winds, and are again all collected and adjusted with their same relative position to each other, there being no addition or subtraction of particles, would it not be the *same* body that previously existed? There would certainly be present *everything* in which the identity consisted, and therefore it must be the same body. Or if there was a change made in some of these particles, some being replaced by others,—for we do not know that in the resurrection the body must be limited to just so few, or so many particles—it would be the same body;—as a pile of apples would be the same pile if some of them should be replaced by others. A new creation is the formation of something which had not previously existed. A restoration, or resurrection, is the bringing again of that which has once existed to its original state. The change may be equivalent to that of a new crea-

tion, or it may be less,—as that which is restored had been more or less resolved into its original elements. The only necessary distinction, is in its previous existence.

Professor Bush then turns to the animal kingdom, and instances the "caterpillar." It casts off its "exuvia," and becomes a butterfly. Here he says:—

"Though it has not the *same body*, yet we have no hesitation in saying it is the *same creature* which we beheld creeping in peristaltic movement along the ground. And we say it is the same, because we perceive here also the unbroken continuity of the vital principle, the true seat and subject of animal identity."—p. 52.

He then supposes the caterpillar should moulder to dust, and 100 years afterwards,

"An insect should appear flapping its gilded wings over the very spot where the preceding structure was decomposed: "all the relation we could discern between the one and the other would be that of priority and posteriority of time." "Now this, we contend, is precisely the difficulty that weighs upon the common theory of the resurrection of the body." "There is just that break " "in the continuous agency of the vital principle which makes it so impossible to discover or define the *relation* between the buried and the beautified body."—p. 53.

With regard to the first supposition of the caterpillar, we cannot conceive how it can be said not to be the same body. It certainly has not a new body; for it has nothing but what was contained within the old body. And though it may have laid aside its outer covering, yet to all intents and purposes, it is the same body.

The objection of "a break in the link," is answered by the same arguments adduced in the illustrations from the vegetable kingdom. The supposition, however, respecting the caterpillar, is not analogous. We will suppose a case. The caterpillar dies and is decomposed.—A Being so intelligent as to identify each individual particle amid all their varied changes, restores each to its place.—We again behold the caterpillar. Who will not say it is the same, although it does not yet live? Life is then infused into it, and it moves along the ground. Here is its resurrection. Man cannot see the relation between the two; and yet that Being who controls all things, has watched those particles in their dispersed and restored condition, and knows the relation they sustain to each other. If, then, that caterpillar should become a butterfly, there would still be the same relation between it in all its several conditions. Man is not enabled to understand all about it: it is not necessary he should. Yet He who has

promised, is able to perform all his pleasure. But if "these dispersed materials are to be re-collected again," how and when is it to be done? Says Professor Bush :—

"How this is to be effected without taking to pieces and unraveling as it were, the whole frame-work of Nature, surpasses conception. And if this is to be the case, when? Is it at the period denominated the last day, when it is for the most part held that the conflagration of the heavens and the earth is to take place? If such be unequivocally the divine testimony, we must of course receive it. But it would surely seem, to human view, *a priori*, a strange and incomprehensible procedure, that the re-gathering of these scattered particles, the re-building of these dilapidated human temples, should be going on in the midst of this scene of 'telluric combustion!' "—p. 54.

We have already seen that from God's ability, if he has designed to raise the dead, he is able, even upon *philosophical principles*, so to arrange and dispose of the individual particles which may have been severally connected with any human remains, so that in all their future combinations they shall be respectively protected from any subsequent disposition that shall in any wise conflict with their ultimate destined restoration, in the resurrection of the same body of which they formed a part at death. And with such an arrangement and disposition, if it is necessary, they can be forthcoming at the desired moment without "a taking to pieces and unraveling the whole frame work of Nature." We however learn, by the volume of inspiration, that all nature *is* to be "unraveled," that "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," that "all these things shall be dissolved." It is not, however, in the midst of this "telluric combustion," that the re-organization of these bodies is to be effected; nor is this "melting" to be for the purpose of effecting this re-organization. It is to be for the purpose of purifying the earth, from all the effects of sin, and the "fall," that it may be a fit territory for the kingdom of God. But before this is accomplished, "the dead in Christ will" be raised, and "we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air:" so those who are raised will thus be beyond the reach of "this scene of 'telluric combustion.'"

After presenting these objections, Professor Bush adds :—

"It is obvious beyond question, that the popular theory reduces us to great extremities of solution. Indeed, we see not but that the difficulties which cluster about it are absolutely insuperable; and if Faith has only this view of the resurrection to present to Philosophy, we cannot perceive any ground for wonder that Philosophy should be slow to receive it; and

yet Philosophy and Faith, like Righteousness and Peace, in the economy of God, are and must be wedded together. True philosophy—and we are here speaking of no other—can never—never—be in conflict with true faith.”—p. 54.

We have endeavored to do justice to Professor Bush's arguments from reason, by presenting them fairly, though not in full. And we flatter ourselves that they have been, so far, “*fairly met*,” as our author justly demanded they should be. We have taken up his various objections, one by one, and endeavored to show,—how successfully others must judge—that there is nothing in right reason which militates against the resurrection of the body; and that these “great extremities of solution,” these “absolutely insuperable” “difficulties which cluster about it,” are all resolved into mere *suppositions*, into bare *possibilities* which *might* stand in the way, if *chance*, and not an Omniscient, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent Being controlled the elements of the Universe. If the resurrection depended upon some germinating power within the body upon which the laws of nature must act to reproduce life, as the *potato* is made to germinate, we would admit the validity of his objections.

But as One, who sees the end from the beginning, controls every minute particular in view of any desired result which He may wish to produce, we have no cause to fear that any obstacles will *chance* to arise to thwart his purposes. There will, therefore, be no natural, physical, or philosophical reasons to oppose what inspiration has affirmed. Consequently, if the Scriptures assure us that the man who dies will live again, it will be even so—true Philosophy and true Faith will alike receive it.

Before we leave the argument from reason, we trust we shall be pardoned in making a few observations on the nature of Faith. It is believing what the Scriptures assert, *because* they assert it. It is not hope; nor is it knowledge. That which can be demonstrated and seen, is no longer a subject of faith. Therefore, “*faith* is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” Our faith is *tested* when a plain scriptural statement is presented for our belief. If we can believe it *because* it is *there recorded*, we exercise true faith in God's word. But if we believe it because it is in accordance with the deductions of science, then we do not believe it because the Bible asserts it. How do we believe “that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do ap-

pear?" It must be by faith in God's word, or by the deductions of philosophy. Is there any thing in the whole circle of the sciences to teach the creation of the world? No, nothing. Then it is by *faith* alone that we understand it. We believe it because the Bible teaches it. The same is true of the flood.—There is nothing in philosophy to explain how the waters could cover the tops of the highest mountains. Looking to philosophy alone, the most profound philosopher would decide to the contrary. How then can we believe it? By *faith* in the word of God. But if Professor Bush should subject those and kindred events to the same rule by which he judges of the resurrection of the dead, he would reject them as "unintelligible ideas." Now if we could not believe what the Bible asserts because the Bible asserts it, and must first submit our faith to the test of philosophy, and then if philosophy indicated that obstacles *might* arise, be obliged to modify our faith to square with our philosophy, we should accuse no one of doing us injustice who should intimate that we had more confidence in the deductions of science than in the word of God. We cannot therefore refrain from asking whether Noah would have "prepared an ark for the saving of his house," whether Abraham would have "hoped against hope," or whether Moses would have ventured across the Red Sea at the parting of the waters, if they had been schooled in Professor Bush's philosophy? And we would most respectfully inquire of Professor Bush, whether, with his views, had he been called as either of those were, he would not have seen "difficulties" "absolutely insuperable" against the fulfillment of those predictions, so that his "Philosophy" would "be slow to receive them?"

All the miracles recorded in the Scriptures might be disproved by such rules of interpretation. And those who have carried them out have argued, that Abraham only *dreamed* he must offer up Isaac; that when Jacob's sinew shrank, it was the result of rheumatism; that the thunderings and lightnings on Mount Sinai at the giving of the "law," were only the result of an accidental thunder-storm; that when Christ walked on the water, he *waded* as far as he could, and then *swam*; that the out-pouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was an accidental gust of wind that struck the house and electrified the disciples; that on Peter's reproof, Ananias only fell down by fright, and was carried out and buried alive, or as Heinrichs says, that Peter stabbed him, &c.

&c. Now these are not merely suppositions, but they are the actual interpretations given of those texts, by such men as Eichhorn, Ammon, Thiess, and other German advocates of scriptural "*Accommodation*," and who would be astonished at the bigotry of any who should question their Christianity, or reverence for the Scriptures. Now if we can believe nothing but what is intelligible, we shall be constrained to believe that those who reject what *they* cannot reconcile with philosophy, have *more regard* for philosophy than for the declarations of inspiration. And yet such may honestly believe that they "yield to no man living in sentiments of profound reverence for the oracles of Scripture."

"DISTINCTION OF PERSONAL AND BODILY IDENTITY."

Under this head, Professor Bush says:—

"The position that the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection necessitates the belief of the resurrection of the same body, enforces upon us the consideration of the subject of identity. We are at once arrested by the inquiry, whether the *identity of the person* implies the *identity of the body*. In strictness of speech, a body which is undergoing a constant change in its constituent particles cannot be said to be the same in any two successive moments of its duration. This of course applies to the human body, the component atoms of which are in a state of ceaseless fluctuation. A precise use of language will not warrant the assertion, that our bodies are the same this hour that they were the last. The paring of a nail, the clipping of a hair, leaves the body a different body from what it was before this subduction from its integrity took place. It is true indeed that for all the purposes of ordinary and popular discourse, it is perhaps an unexceptionable mode of diction to say that we have in mature life the same bodies that we had in childhood. But when we subject the phraseology to a rigid test, it is obvious that it cannot be true. That cannot be the same through a given lapse of time, which is constantly changing its constituent parts during that time. How then is it possible to affirm with philosophical accuracy, that I have the same body to-day that I had twenty years ago? And it would certainly be hard to show that that which is philosophically false is theologically true." pp. 58, 59.

This reasoning is extended to considerable length, in which we will not follow him, because we find that as far as *fact* is concerned, we should not vary materially from him respecting this question; although we might in the use of terms and in defining our understanding respecting it. We believe in no "immortal bone in the extremity of the *os coccygis*,"* nor in any "immovable matter" to perpetuate the identity of the body. Nor do we deny these continued progressive

* "The Jews have an opinion that the *os coxendicis*, the lower joint of the back-bone, survives the corruption of the body; and that it is out of this bone that the resurrection body is formed."—*Clark's Com.* Vol. 7. p. 289.

changes, by which the material of the body may be repeatedly entirely displaced by other particles, and in which sense it is not the same body. There is, however, another sense in which the body is the same, independent of the spirit which animates it. Thus in the case of a tree.—It is subject to the same philosophical changes that man is. It has no properties of thought, reason, or sensation ; and yet it preserves its *identity*, not of particles, but the tree is the same. All its peculiarities are the same ; and however long it may continue, all recognize it as the same old tree; and none mistake it for any other tree. As this is true of a tree, so it is also true of the human body. We recognize the child in the man. There is the same general expression, the same natural marks or scars, and peculiarities of the body, by which we recognize that it is the same body. Even after death, and every particle in it may have been changed since we previously saw it, we are sensible it is the same body.

The body grows in size and vigor for a certain time, and then becomes old and decrepid ; whereas, were there no bodily identity, we could not conceive why, as there is a continual addition of fresh particles, it should ever cease to be vigorous. Contagious diseases of certain kinds, if experienced at the earliest age, ever after protect the body from subsequent attacks of the same disease, although not a particle that was previously infected, may remain in the system. In the case of a beast, which Professor Bush claims has no personality, we are conscious that it is the same animal, from the calf to the ox, from the colt to the horse, &c. There must therefore be an identity of the body independent of the identity of the spirit which animates it. And yet as far as the philosophical fact is concerned, we would not dissent particularly from Professor Bush respecting it. He however asks :—

"If a man rises in the morning with a different body from that with which he lay down—though he still remains the same person, with what propriety can he be said to rise from his grave with the same body with which he entered it?"—p. 63.

If Professor Bush wishes to be understood that in the resurrection there will be the *same relation* between the body that is raised from the grave, and that which entered it, as there is between the body with which a man rises, and the body with which he retired, we will admit to any extent he pleases the want of identity. For such a relation is all we claim. But if he does not admit the *same relation* in the

two cases, the comparison is not analogous. And especially it cannot be, if, as we understand him, he denies a material body at the resurrection. But whatever may be said with regard to bodily identity while living, we cannot see that that will affect the question of a resurrection of the body. As a man rises in the morning, may he not arise in the resurrection, with the same relation to the body he put off at death, as the body with which he rises in the morning bears to the one with which he lay down at night? It certainly does not prevent his being restored to the last body he inhabited. We will therefore proceed to the consideration of his next proposition:—

"THE TRUE BODY OF THE RESURRECTION AS INFERRED BY REASON."

He says:—

"The succession of particles in the human body may be compared to the successive members of a corporate society formed under a charter." "Let us suppose that this company, after being in existence for a number of years, should at length, and long before the term of the charter expires, become virtually extinct by the death of all but one or two of its members, who become remiss in acting any longer in their corporate capacity. We will imagine again, that after the lapse of a considerable interval, it is proposed to resuscitate the company. What are the leading ideas involved in the supposition? Would it be at all inferred that the former members were to be restored to life and organized anew? Does the renovated life of the company imply the reviviscence of the individual members who have previously formed it?" "The vitality, so to speak, is in the charter, and there its identity is seated." "So far, then, as we can perceive, the revival of the corporate society is not the revival in any sense of the original members, but merely the revival of the inherent formative or organic power of the charter. The charter is the living nucleus—the germ—the ground-element—to which the new social fabric owes its existence."—p. 69.

This figure expresses very fairly our views of the resurrection; but we see a more striking analogy. The charter is the soul, the society is the body, the members of the company are the constituent particles of the body,—these may be continually changed, increased, or lessened, and it is still the same society, or body, even if none of the original members are left. Those which remain cease to act in a corporate capacity; and the society dies. Now how can this society be revived? Must all the original members be restored? Answer, No. It must be done and can be done only by the members which remained, the body put off at death, again acting in a

corporate capacity. While the charter alone existed, it would be as ineffective as the souls under the altar, crying, "How long, O Lord?" * and the society could not be resuscitated by merely new members, for that would be another society; and the terms of all charters make them available only to those to whom they are granted, and such others as may by their consent become united with them. A company of entirely new members could not be formed under an old charter, but by a special legislative act; and then it would be a new society with the same name and powers. The resuscitation of a corporate society must therefore be like the resurrection of the body, a restoration of the charter, the soul, to those members, particles, which relinquished it at death. After its resuscitation these members might add to their number or not, as circumstances should render necessary. As Professor Bush has selected this figure, we most fully subscribe to its appropriateness as an illustration. The conclusion that he arrives at, is, that

"The resurrection body is that part of our present being to which the essential life of the man pertains. We may not be able to see it, to handle it, or to analyze it, or to describe it. But we know that it exists, because we know that we ourselves exist. It constitutes the inner essential vitality of our present bodies, and it lives again in another state, *because it never dies*. It is immortal in its own nature, and it is called a *body*—a *spiritual body*—because the poverty of human language, or perhaps the *weakness* of the human mind, forbids the adoption of any more fitting term by which to express it."—p. 70.

That which cannot be seen, handled, analyzed, or described, must be a strange body! nor can we see how Professor Bush can have an "intelligible idea" respecting such a body, so as to receive it. We are also at a loss to understand by what rules of philosophy such a body can be demonstrated to exist. It can therefore only be believed by faith, or by supposition.

Professor Bush has not, however, carried out the analogy of his own illustration. After showing the death and resuscitation of a corporate body to illustrate the resurrection, instead of using the resuscitated society, as he must to carry out the figure, he takes the charter, at the death of the old society, for the symbol of his resurrection body! Who cannot see a want of harmony in his illustration? And yet he ventures to affirm in view of such reasoning, that

* Rev. vi. 10.

"If it be sound, we not only calmly repose in the conclusion, but are unshaken also in the conviction, that revelation, *rightly interpreted*, must harmonize with it."—p. 71.

It is true, that if it were "*sound*" reasoning, "*revelation must harmonize with it.*" But it is none the less true, that if it *were* sound reasoning, it would *harmonize with "revelation."* If, however, revelation seemed to harmonize with *such* reasoning, we should fear we did not read revelation aright. Again he says:—

"While our reason assures us that the power of thought does not pertain to the gross physical fabric which remains when the inhabiting spirit has taken its flight, we are still unable to resist the impression, that it does inhere in something which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle."—p. 72.

This "something" he speaks of in another place, as composed of "subtle elements mixed up in the grosser materials of our bodies, with which our mental operations are connected, and upon which they are dependent;" and adds, "and we cannot know but that they may exist separate from our bodies and form, in fact, in the strictest propriety of speech, a spiritual body."—p. 77.

Again he says:—

"It would seem then on the whole, from a collation of all the grounds on which an opinion is to be formed, that the judgment of reason would be, *that a spiritual body is developed at death.* By *spiritual*, in this connection, we mean refined, subtle, ethereal, sublimated. By the development of a spiritual body, we mean the disengagement—the extrication—of that psychical part of our nature with which vital and animal functions are, in the present life, intimately connected, and which differs from the pure spirit, the intellectual principle, as the "*sensitive principle* differs from "*the self-conscious intelligence.* It is a *tertium quid*—an intermediate something between the cogitative faculty and the gross body. It is indeed invisible; but so are many of the mightiest agents in nature, and so are many of the noblest entities in the ranks of created beings."—p. 78.

That "the power of thought" does "inhere in something which goes forth at the same time with the vital principle," and that this "may exist separate from our bodies," we are not disposed to question. The point here at issue, is, whether this is the spiritual body which Paul speaks of, that was sown a natural body; or whether it is merely that part of man which constitutes the *spirit* that returns to God that gave it, when the dust shall return to the earth as it was; * and which waits to be re-united to its dust again. A body eliminated from another body cannot, in any use of terms, be called a resurrection body. Nothing had previously fallen

* Eccl. xii. 7.

which is here raised up: it is rather a casting off, a change of condition, a disengagement from a previous state. So that if that were the true view, the illustrations and use of terms explanatory of the resurrection, in the Scriptures, even if they were only figurative and metaphorical, would be most unhappily chosen. Neither would such be analogous to insect transformations: for there it is the old body with new capacities that is eliminated from a mere exuviae or outward covering in which it was previously incased, which constituted but a small, and no essential part of the body; but according to this supposition, *all* of the entire body which is apparent to any of our senses remains, eliminating a mere invisible agency. And even if this agency were to receive a spiritual body at death, in exchange for the material body, it could not be a resurrection; it would be a mere transition, a passing from one body to another, a transmigration; and instead of a resurrection it would be a new creation.

Again, if this were the true view of the resurrection, Hymeneus and Philetus would not have been in error in saying, "That the resurrection is past already;"* nor would such "words" have "eat as a canker," or "overthrown the faith of any." For if the resurrection is at death, it would in that age have been "past" to all who had died, and they should rather have been commended than censured for such teachings. The Bible also speaks of those who died in the faith, as not having received the promises, but as still to receive them, as having seen them afar off,—not nigh at death,—and as expecting to be satisfied, not when they should fall asleep, but when they should awake in His likeness. The Bible teaches a space between death and the resurrection; but this theory makes it an instantaneous change. Those who have departed, are everywhere spoken of as having fallen asleep; and we are told that we shall not all sleep, but we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall be changed. Now if the change that Professor Bush speaks of, was all the resurrection the dead will, or do experience, it would not be true that we who may be alive at Christ's coming, shall any the less sleep than those who have gone before us; for our change would be the same as theirs. Nor would any sleep.

The church in its apostolic age received no such understanding of the doctrine of the resurrection from any of the teachings which they received. Dr. Pearson says, that the

* 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.

souls of none enter heaven until the resurrection, "is the opinion generally received in the schools and delivered as the sense of the church of God in all ages."—*Creed* p. 363. Again he says, "The most ancient of the fathers whose writings are extant, were so far from believing" that the saints are translated to heaven, "that they thought them not to be in heaven yet, nor ever to be removed from that place in which they were before Christ's death, until the general resurrection." Among these he enumerates Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hilary, Gregory Nissen, Novation, &c. And to this belief he says there were very few, if any exceptions, "for above five hundred years after Christ."—*Ib.* p. 371.

We thus learn that the faith once delivered to the saints, was received by them in its literal acceptation. Those who sat under the teachings of the apostles, looked forward to a resurrection of the body, as they would not, had they been otherwise indoctrinated. And a view of any doctrine, of which no trace can be found in the primitive church, can have but little support from their understanding of the Scriptures. Professor Bush admits, that

"We cannot say, indeed, that the evidence of this induction is *demonstrative*; it is at best perhaps but *presumptive*; yet the presumption is extremely strong."—p. 78.

If it is at best but *presumptive*, we feel that in support even of the resurrection of the body, "we have a more sure word of prophecy;" and that it becomes us more to take heed to it, than to any merely presumptive argument.

But, says Professor Bush,

We may "justly propose the question of the *cui bono* in relation to the resurrection of our former bodies. What purpose can they be supposed to answer, provided we have, as all reasoning and analogy tends to establish, spiritual bodies that have emanated from the material bodies wisely adapted to a spiritual world?"—p. 80.

We may not be able to comprehend the precise good that will be accomplished by the resurrection of the body; and we may not be able to say what good has been accomplished even by its creation. If its restoration is useless, it will not be done: if it is to be done, it will be for wise purposes. We however conceive, that it is because we do not at death, as Professor Bush supposes we do, receive a spiritual body that is adapted to our destined state, and that the resurrection is to supply that deficiency. But as the clay has no right to say to the potter, Why hast thou made me thus? nei-

ther do we suppose we have any right to demand the "why," for any future change God may see fit to make in our physical structure. Again he says:—

"We are well aware that in view of all this, the two-fold question will be at once proposed—What *proof* is there of its truth, and if true, how is it to be reconciled with what are regarded as the express averments of Holy Writ? We have already admitted that *the solution propounded cannot be demonstrated to be true*, although we doubt not there is constantly accumulating evidence that it is true; and if it be, it follows of course that the Scriptures must be interpreted so as to agree with it." And, "If the letter of revelation holds forth a view of the doctrine which arrays itself against the clearest evidence of facts, and the soundest process of reasoning, is there no demand, on the other side, for the reconciliation of Scripture with science?"—p. 81.

It will be time enough to ask this question, when "the letter of revelation *does* array itself" against "*the clearest evidence of facts* and the *soundest process of reasoning*." But while it is admitted that "the solution propounded CANNOT be demonstrated to be true," there will be no "war" of "acknowledged truths," if it does not "harmonize" with the Scriptures. But we can hardly conceive how such a question should be propounded respecting a proposition, which, it is admitted, cannot be demonstrated to be true, by one who says,

"For ourselves, we yield to no man living in sentiments of profound reverence for the oracles of Scripture."—p. 82.

Had he said for the oracles of *presumptive evidence*, it would harmonize more with some of his reasoning. He however supposes that evidence will accumulate to prove his theory, and that

"It will be at length everywhere conceded, that the destinies of our being are to be evolved according to established laws, and not in violation of them. These laws will be developed by the progress of scientific research, the conclusions of which will carry with them a force of authority as irresistible as the *literal* announcements of the sacred text; and nothing can be gained for the interests of revelation, by lifting up a standard against them."—p. 84.

Here is an exhibition of the reverence he has for the Scriptures. He is willing to place them upon an *equal* footing with his presumptive evidence; but, look out, nothing will be gained by setting up revelation above it! This, in our view, is asking too much for man's presumptive conclusions, and is derogatory to the Word of God. It is placing God and man too nearly upon a level; or rather, it is permitting man to dictate terms to the Almighty! We would not, however, be understood as intimating that our Author would not himself give

the preponderance to revelation. It is of the *tendency* of his views we speak. He says :—

“ If the teachings of that divine volume array themselves so unequivocally and inexorably against the conclusions to which we are brought by the argument from reason, that we can by no process of conciliation harmonize the two, undoubtedly we are required to abide by the Scriptural decision, whatever violence it may seem to do to our rational deductions. But this deference to Scripture, in opposition to the demands of a seemingly incontrovertible logic, can never be claimed but upon the ground of an *absolute assurance* of having obtained the true sense of the inspired oracles on this subject.”—p. 85.

It would seem, however, from the above, that *if* the Scriptures can by any process of ratiocination be twisted, moulded, explained, or accommodated, so as to avoid its literal sense, that it is to be thus disposed of. And this is the process, in disproof of the resurrection of the body, that we are next to consider. We therefore come to

“ THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.”

This forms the second part of his work. He commences with a few “ preliminary remarks,” in illustration of the *principle* which is applicable to the interpretation of these Scriptures. He argues that

“ The Bible “ deals in two distinct classes of subjects—those which are originally *within* the limits of man’s rational powers, and those which are *without*. Truths that are purely scientific, fall into the former class.”—p. 86.

He then contends that “ The results to which reason is brought in its researches, in many of the departments of science, may be regarded as certain,”—as “ *demonstrated truths* ;” and refers to the sciences of astronomy and geology, and the discoveries therein, as evidence. We are not disposed to controvert the proposition thus laid down. But the question is, whether this is a subject purely scientific. It was long since asked, “ If a man die, shall he live again ?” and all the philosophy in the world could furnish no answer. It was acknowledged that there is “ hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again ;” but man’s resurrection could only be known by faith in the word of God. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is unaffected by this proposition, unless an event, dependent *only* upon the fiat of the Almighty, is to be determined by the deductions of science. He further argues, that

"Instead of finding the earth at the centre of the system, he finds the sun there. But the Scriptures, speaking according to appearance, represent the earth as the central body, and the sun and the stars as revolving around. What shall he do? shall he give up his conclusions because the *letter* of revelation is in conflict with them, when at the same time he is just as well assured of their truth, as he is that there is any sun or earth at all?"—p. 87.

Again he asks :—

"Are we not left as free by the Creator to abide by the ascertained results of physiology, as by those of astronomy or geology? Is not certainly a conclusion as attainable in the one case as in the other? And is it not just as probable that the Scriptures should speak according to *appearance*, and in conformity with the then state of knowledge?" "Are not the Scriptures constructed on this point, as on all others having respect to physical subjects, in reference to the then state of knowledge—to the popular impression and belief—among those for whom they were originally designed?"—p. 90.

In the above we are brought to the consideration of an important question, viz., How far do the Scriptures speak in accordance with men's opinions? It is true that so far as language is concerned, this is often done. Thus we read of the "four corners of the earth," when it is round and without corners; of an "understanding heart," when the head is the seat of knowledge; of "the rising of the sun," and "the going down thereof," when it is stationary as respects the earth, &c. But let us bear in mind that it is nowhere said, that the earth *is not* round, or that it *is* a plain with four corners; that the heart *is* the seat of understanding; that the earth *is* in the centre of this system, or that the sun revolves around it. Nor is there a single direct and positive statement in the Bible that the researches of science have in any way disproved: consequently, it does not follow, because language is sometimes used in accordance with the understanding of the men of that age, when nothing *positively* is asserted, that plain and positive and absolute statements are made to accommodate men's understanding. Such a conclusion would drive us to a denial that *anything* could be learned from the Scriptures corrective of men's ideas; as they would be only an index of what *men thought* in that age: for if such a rule was applicable to the resurrection, it is to the entire teachings of the Bible.

I know it is claimed that geology is in opposition to the letter of the Scriptures. The Bible teaches that we are only about six thousand years from the time of Adam, while geologists contend that the world is much older. Now if this was

all true, there would not necessarily be a contradiction ; for the Scriptures only give us a chronology from the creation of Adam, whereas geologists themselves contend, that the marks of age on the earth were anterior to his time. So that if their deductions were correct, it must have respect to an interval, between the beginning when God created the heavens and earth, and the commencement of its being re-modelled, when the earth was without form. Between those two periods, there might have been room for all the changes, producing all the results for which geologists contend. It has not, therefore, been shown that a single positive declaration of God's word has been ever modified by scientific discoveries. And as those texts upon which the doctrine of the resurrection is based are *positive* declarations, the accomodated use of language referred to is not analogous, and cannot affect the doctrine. Or, if it might be thus affected, Professor Bush does not contend *he* has arrived at that certainty in physiological researches, as we have in astronomical : so that again the two cases are not parallel. But, believing that the positive declarations of God's word may be thus *stretched*, he says, that

"In nothing is the divine wisdom more conspicuous than in what we may term the *elasticity of import* in the language of the sacred volume."—p. 91.

How *elastic* the Scriptures will be found, we shall see as we progress in our review. The next point upon which he dwells, is

"THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION."

He argues that the intimations in the Old Testament

"Do not distinguish very precisely between the doctrine of the *resurrection*, technically so termed, and that of a *future existence* or *immortality*. So far at least as the tenet of the resurrection is supposed necessarily to include the idea of the living again of the physical body, we shall probably look in vain for a single passage that unequivocally asserts it."—p.93.

When we find such texts as the following, it does not seem that we thus "look in vain : " viz., Job, xix. 26,—“And though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God ;” Psal. xvii. 15—“I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness ;” Isa. xxvi. 19, “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise ;” Ezek. xxxvii. 12, “I will open your graves and bring you up

out of your graves ; " Dan. xii. 2,—“ And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” &c. If any language is unequivocal, the above most surely is ; so that the question, “ Why, if it be taught in the New Testament, it is not taught in the Old, and *vice versa* ? ” “ may ” not “ be pronounced a question of very difficult solution,” from the simple fact that the resurrection is plainly taught in both. He, however, admits that this doctrine

“ Enters into the articles of the Jewish creed, and as their creed professedly rests upon the Old Testament alone, it would seem a problem difficult to be solved, whence their faith on this subject was derived, if not from the writings of Moses and the prophets.”—p. 93.

In speaking of the “ *Definition of Terms*,” he shows the various words in the Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek, used to denote the resurrection,—the principal one in the Greek being *Anastasis*, which he adopts as the title of his work ; and he admits the usage of these words “ is founded upon ideas drawn from visible objects and phenomena, and such as were appropriate to a general belief of the resurrection, the standing up again of the defunct body.”—p. 96. But he argues that that usage is of little importance—that “ the truth of the doctrine is one thing, and the Jewish construction of it another.” He then proceeds to the

“ EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR PASSAGES.”

The first texts to which reference is made are in Gen. xvii. 7, 8, where God promises to give to Abraham *and* his seed, “ all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession.” He quotes “ Menasseh Ben Israel (De Resurrec. Mort. L. i. c. 1, § 4,)” as saying, “ It is plain that Abraham and the rest of the Patriarchs did not possess that land ; it follows therefore, that they must be raised in order to enjoy the promised good, as otherwise the promises of God would be vain and false. Hence, therefore, is proved not only the immortality of the soul, but also the essential *foundation of the law*, to wit : the resurrection of the dead.” He also says, “ Mede also puts the same construction upon the words, and it is generally adopted by the Millenarian writers.”—p. 97. Thus we have the sense of the Jewish and the early Christian writers,—Mede being of their faith. To this Professor Bush objects that “ *if* ” his previous “ reasoning be sound,” disproving the resurrec-

tion of the same body, the body of Abraham can no more be raised than those of the rest of the race. But, we reply, if his reasoning is *unsound*, as we think we have shown, it militates nothing.

His second objection is, that the word "*and*," is *very often* synonymous with *even*," so that the promise is to Abraham, *even* to his seed; and he thinks this sense here is proved by Gen. xv. 18, where God says, "Unto thy seed have I given this land,"—"his posterity" being "his representative." But as he has not shown that "*and*" is *always* synonymous with "*even*," it *may* not be in the case before us. Nor can the promise of the land to his seed in another place preclude its being given to Abraham; for both him and his seed are included in the promise in the text. We, however, have positive scriptural testimony in opposition to Professor Bush's reasoning. In Ex. vi. 3, 4, God assures Moses that he appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and had established his "covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." And our Savior assures us, Luke xx. 37, that Moses showed at the bush, that the dead are raised when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Stephen assures us, Acts vii. 5, that God gave Abraham none inheritance in the land of Canaan; "no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." While Paul assures us, Gal. iii. 16—29, that the "promises" "to Abraham and his seed," were made to "Christ;" and that "if ye are Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise." He also testifies, Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40, that Abraham and the other faithful worthies, "all died in faith, not having received the promises," [They had been fulfilled to none even in Paul's day,] "but having seen them afar off,"—not nigh at death—and "that they without us should not be made perfect." We are therefore satisfied, that resting upon these texts alone, sustained as they are by God's own expositions, the resurrection of the body is fully made out. Their language is not "elastic" enough to destroy their literal import.

He next refers to

Job xix. 25—27. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and that though after my skin, worms destroy my body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." &c.

In disposing of this, he argues that the book of Job was not written by a Jew, or one who had any knowledge of a promised Messiah; that this passage has various renderings; that Job is not "cited in the New Testament as an example of *faith*," but only of "*patience*;" that Job is not therein referred to as a *prophet*; that the word there translated Redeemer, "is variously rendered by interpreters, *vindicator*, *avenger*, *deliverer*," and had reference to Job's being healed, and God's vindicating his innocence from the false charges of his friends; and that his seeing God was fulfilled when he exclaimed, xlii. 5, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but *now mine eye seeth thee*;" also that it was not supposed by the Jews to refer to the resurrection, nor is thus quoted by many who are the strongest in that belief.

Notwithstanding these objections, the letter of the text, with the Professor's modifications, seems still to favor a literal resurrection; but as there are other texts sufficient to prove the doctrine, we are willing he should have the full benefit of all these objections.

He next quotes Psa. xvi. 9, 10, where we read, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." He says:—

"The fact of a resurrection is undoubtedly taught in these words, and yet from the inspired comment of Peter, Acts ii. 29—31, it is clear that it is a resurrection predicated of the body of Christ, and not of the bodies of men in general." And as the body here spoken of was *not* to see corruption, and the bodies of men *do*, "How then can this passage be adduced in proof of the general doctrine of the resurrection of the body?"—pp. 104, 105.

The answer to this question, we find in the language of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 12—20, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." &c. Now as Professor Bush admits that Christ's resurrection is undoubtedly here taught, and as Paul, speaking by inspiration, assures us, that if Christ be raised, there will be a resurrection of the dead, it follows that the doctrine of the resurrection must be contained in this text.

He next quotes Psa. xvii. 15, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." He translates it—"I shall be satisfied in the awaking, with thy likeness,—understanding it of the beatific vision to be enjoyed," "when the righteous dead

are to be gloriously manifested as risen from the dead, but not in a sense to include a *resurrection of their bodies*." He thinks it may describe the "transition of the disembodied spirit from earth to heaven at the moment of dissolution."—pp. 105, 106.

It, however, cannot have such a reference; for Peter assures us that "David is not ascended into the heavens;" and Paul testifies, Heb. xi. 32, 39, that David had not received the promise.

He then refers to Psal. xlix. 14, 15, the import of which he supposes to be, that while the wicked has no hope, the righteous hath hope in his death. But as we cannot dwell on these more collateral passages, we proceed.

He next quotes Isa. xxv. 7, 8, "He will swallow up death in victory;" and assumes that the "death" is not used "in its natural and ordinary acceptation, but as another term," for "everything which causes grief, mourning and tribulation," and which he claims is its use in Rev. xxi. 4, "There shall be no more *death*." Paul, however, assures us, 1 Cor. xv. 54, that "the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory,' will be brought to pass 'at the last trump,' when 'this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality'—at the resurrection.

To this Professor Bush replies, "that such cannot be the meaning of Paul, *provided* it be not the meaning of Isaiah." And he argues, that Isaiah "is merely setting before us one of the links in the great chain of events which are to distinguish the latter days of Zion's welfare;" and that the last trump is merely "the *commencement*" of the "ultimate bliss and glory" of this world. But he has offered no proof of a long duration of the present world, that the "death" referred to is not physical death, or that the meaning of Isaiah is not of the resurrection. If there were any *obscurity* respecting Isaiah's meaning, the comments of Paul should decide its true meaning: for upon the principle that God reveals his truth, "here a little and there a little," more obscurely at first, and afterwards more clearly; we can only regard the New Testament as an illustration and explication of the Old; so that the New settles the meaning of the Old, and not the Old, of the New.

His next text in order, is

Isa. xxvi. 19,—“Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead

body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust : for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead."

Professor Bush argues, that "together with," is not in the original ; and

"As the general scope of the chapter is to celebrate the national deliverance from exile and bondage, and the destruction of the enemies who had tyrannized over them, so the drift of this paragraph is to draw a graphic contrast between the lot of their former lordly oppressors, and the favored and felicitous condition of the chosen people themselves." He also argues, that the "dead" are "civilly dead ;" and that "my dead body," "is merely a collective term for the restored mass of the Jewish nation." —pp. 114—121.

The defect in this argument, is, that it is only an *assumption* that the "scope of the chapter" is to celebrate a "national deliverance." The subject is commenced in the 24th chapter, where it is said, "The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage." "In that day," we read, "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients, gloriously." That this is Christ's personal reign in the New Jerusalem, is evident from the context in the 25th chapter. Here we are told, that "He will swallow up death in victory," which Paul assures us is at the "last trump ;" and the prophet adds, "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God ; we have waited for him, and he will save us : this is the Lord ; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Then the same subject is continued through the next chapter, with no allusion to a national deliverance ; but closes with, "For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity : the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain." So that if the meaning of the text is to be decided by the general scope of the context, it must have respect to the time of Christ's Second Advent, and not to a mere Jewish national restoration. And the resurrection which is brought to view, must be, not a mere restoration to civil rights, but the resurrection of the dead.

His next reference is to Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14, where is recorded the vision of the valley of dry bones, with God's interpretation of it. He says :—

"The vision" "goes on to state that the bones came together, were clothed with flesh and skin, were animated with a reviving breath, and

finally, that 'they lived and stood up on their feet, an exceeding great army.' If the reader were to proceed no farther, he might conclude that the grand scope of the vision was to teach the doctrine of the *literal resurrection of the body*; but the Spirit of inspiration immediately furnishes the true clew to the oracle, by expressly assuring us that the bones were symbols, not of actually deceased men, but of the Israelites in their long-continued state of extreme affliction and depression, while remaining captive in the country of their enemies, as dead bones from the grave; and that the revivification of the dry bones is a symbol of the certain revival of the Jewish state, by the restoration of the people to their own land."—p. 122.

It follows from the above, that whether we are to understand this as teaching a literal resurrection, or the restoration of the Jews, depends entirely upon the explanation of this vision, which God gives in verses 11—14. And the point in that explanation is the declaration, "Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel." But it does not consequently follow, that "the whole house of Israel," is Israel in bondage. If we take the inspired definition which Paul gives of "all Israel," it can only respect the host of the redeemed. He assures us, Rom. ii. 25—29, that those are not Jews who are so outwardly; "but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." And ix. 6—8, that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel"—that "the children of the flesh" are not "the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." And we learn in Rom. xi., that all who believe are grafted into the olive tree, and all who disbelieve are broken off; and that the full number of the Jews who will come in, and the full number of the Gentiles, will complete the number of God's elect, and constitute "all Israel" who will be saved, as it is written in Isa. lix. 20, when "the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them *that turn from transgression* in Jacob." "The whole house of Israel" must consequently be all of God's children; and none else. And that these are the ones to be resurrected, is also proved by God's explanation referred to,—i. e. if Professor Bush will permit us to take it all as literally as he would understand the word "Israel."—For, "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel,"—i. e. the renewed earth promised to Abraham and his seed, not "through the law, but through the righteousness of faith,"—Rom. iv. 13; and who must come up out of their graves to inherit it. We therefore unite most fully with Professor Bush in the following conclusion:—

"So far as the letter is concerned, it would be difficult to find any other passage in the Scriptures, where so much is said respecting the opening of graves, and the bringing up out of graves; and yet nothing can be more expressive, and consequently more imperative, than the interpretation which the Spirit of God himself puts upon the prophetic scenery, and to which the commentator *must* adhere, whatever inferential additions he may see fit to graft upon it."—p. 123.

He next refers to Hosea vi. 2, and xiii. 14, but we shall pass over these more collateral evidences, and proceed to his examination of

Dan. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

"This brief passage," says Professor Bush, "contains more emphatically, perhaps, than any other in the Old Testament, the germ of the resurrection doctrine. It is incessantly referred to by the Rabbinical writers, who have treated of the subject, and has exercised a controlling influence on the literal statements of Christ and the apostles!!"—p. 131.

He gives as the correct explication of it, —

"And many of the sleepers of the dust shall awake; these (the awakened) (shall be) to everlasting life; and those (the unawakened) (shall be) to shame and everlasting contempt,"—the same that "is suggested, as he says, by some of the Jewish school, and is undoubtedly very ancient." Aben Ezra renders it, "'Those who awake shall be (appointed) to everlasting life, and those who awake not, shall be (doomed) to shame and everlasting contempt.' The words of Gaon himself, are, that 'this is the resurrection of the dead of Israel, whose lot is to eternal life, and those who shall not awake, are the forsakers of Jehovah.'" &c.—p. 134.

This, then, clearly establishes the fact, that whatever the nature of this resurrection may be, it is only the righteous that are to be raised when Michael shall stand up; so that the difficulty it has presented, and the evidence that has been attempted to be deduced therefrom, in support of the resurrection of the righteous and wicked at the same time, are entirely destroyed. It will also be seen, that the explication admitted to be the most correct and literal, if taken in its most literal sense, is even more favorable to our views of the resurrection, than the letter of the common version. How then can this text be disposed of? Says Professor Bush,

"Still the question recurs, What kind of a resurrection is that here announced, and to what time is it to be referred?" He then argues, that the context indicates

"An extended order of events stretching onwards, through a long lapse of centuries, to the time, whatever that may be, when Daniel himself is to 'stand up in his lot at the end of the days.'" And as it is connected with "a period of distinguished trouble, when Michael the Great Prince is to stand up for Daniel's people, and as the same language occurs in the de-

scription of this trouble with that which is applied to the calamities experienced at the destruction of Jerusalem—viz., that there never had been and never would be a scene of equal distress—it seems fair to infer that the woes of that period are at least *included* in the present prediction.”

He conceives this prediction ushers in “that new dispensation which was to be offered by the Messiah at his death and resurrection,” and recognizes

“An incipient fulfillment of this oracle, not only in the several individual instances of resuscitation of the dead recorded in the gospels, but more especially in that remarkable display of resurrection power which was put forth upon the many bodies of the saints that slept, which arose, and came out of their graves after his resurrection;” but “still having a more special reference to events that should distinguish the *commencing period* of that grand era to which they pertained.” And he adds, “So far then, the words of the prophet may be construed as having respect to a literal resurrection. But this we regard as, in the main, a mere outward and sensible adumbration of a far more glorious work of moral quickening.”—pp. 134—136.

To this we reply, that the *context* does indicate an extended order of events extending to Daniel’s standing in his lot. But it does not therefore follow that the *text* will cover the same extended period. It is rather the consummation of that period. We also admit that there is a connection between the time of trouble here spoken of, and the one in Matt. xxiv.—that, the commencement, and this, the close, of a long period of trouble, extending from the time of Jerusalem’s overthrow to the end of the world. But if it had its incipient fulfillment in the individual instances of restoration to life recorded in the Gospel, and in the resurrection when Christ arose, of the bodies of the saints who slept; then its incipient fulfillment was a literal and material one. And if it has “a more special reference” to the “commencing period” of the universal establishment of God’s kingdom, it follows that then there must also be a literal resurrection, unless Professor Bush would have us reason “from *unlike* to *unlike*.” But as he admits “so far as the *words* of the prophet may be construed,” that this is a prediction of a “*literal resurrection*,” we will proceed to the examination of his reasons for regarding it as only the “*adumbration*” of a “moral quickening.”

In proof of this, he first adduces “testimonies from the Rabbinical school,” who believed, according to Sohar, that “In the world to come,” God would “vivify the dead, and raise them from the dust, so that they shall be no more of an

earthly structure," but "subsist as structures firm and durable."

But what have the traditions of the Rabbies to do in the decision of the question whether the Scriptures are to be received, or not, in their literal acceptation? For we are expressly assured by our Savior, that they made the word of God of none effect by their traditions.—Mark vii. 13. But even here this tradition can have only respect to the resurrection of the body, for that alone can be raised from the dust. And so with the opinion he quotes of R. Saadiah, that the "dead Israelites" are to be "brought out of their sepulchres," "*in this world*" (*or age*) it is none the less literal, than if it were in the *future* age. Even we contend that the resurrection of the righteous is to be in this age, but at its very close. Nor does the "prevalent impression of the Jews" referred to, "that the resurrection there spoken of pertains more especially to their own nation," make it any the less a *literal* resurrection. But he says:—

"From the teachings of our Lord and his apostles, we learn that all men are *dead* in trespasses and in sins; and that the effect of the Gospel, attended by the energetic influence of the Holy Spirit, is to *quicken* its recipients into a new and divine life, which, as it is a virtual resurrection while they are yet in the body, issues by necessary consequence in that consummated resurrection which accrues to them upon their leaving the body."—p. 138.

Let it here be remembered, that when merely moral death is presented, the quickening from it is in *no place* spoken of in the Scriptures as a resurrection. But if recovery from moral death is a moral resurrection, must not, — unless we reason "from unlike to unlike," — the recovery from physical death be a physical resurrection?

He then quotes a number of passages where he argues it is literally a resurrection "*from* the dead," "from out the dead," &c., showing that *all* the dead are not raised in the resurrection there referred to, and which he argues gives us "*a usus loquendi*," referring directly to this text in Daniel; "and if so," he says:—

"The proof, we believe, must be regarded as conclusive, that that passage, in its more legitimate and primary import, does not convey the idea of the *resurrection of the body*."—p. 140.

This is a most strange conclusion. It seems then that the "sum" of his argument amounts to about this. The words of the text, taken literally, predict the resurrection of the body; but the Jews looked to a literal resurrection of their

own nation, and many of them believed they would rise out of the dust; and the resurrection is often spoken of as being only a part of the dead; and therefore *none* of the dead are to be raised! Q. E. D?

This is all the force we can see in his argument. But let us examine for a moment the great objection, that it refers to only a part of the dead raised from among the dead. The force of this seems to be contained in a note he quotes from "Noble's Appeal," viz., that when Paul speaks of "attaining unto the resurrection of the dead," "he evidently speaks of something as attainable in this life,—otherwise his modest notice 'not as though I had already attained,' would be nonsense;" and if by "striving to attain unto the resurrection of the dead," he meant "the resurrection of dead bodies, which all are to experience, whether they strive for it or not," it would be strange "talk."—p. 140.

Now all the force of this objection arises from the error which the spiritualists have run into, in supposing the resurrection of the righteous and wicked is all to transpire at the same time; when the letter of inspiration is positive, that those who attain unto the resurrection of the righteous "from among the dead," will be raised one thousand years before the rest of the dead will be raised, who rise not at the first resurrection. This harmonizes all those texts which speak of "out from the dead," &c., and strengthens the doctrine of two resurrections. Paul, in striving to attain unto this resurrection, was looking to something in the future. And it could not be a moral resurrection for which he was looking; for he had passed that change; and consequently he was striving to attain unto the resurrection of the righteous which no man will attain unto without thus striving.

Thus, in view of all the admissions of Professor Bush respecting the letter of the various texts favoring a literal resurrection, and the arguments he has used to prove their figurative use, we are more than ever convinced that the resurrection of the body is not only not disproved by the argument from reason, but that it is most emphatically a doctrine of the Old Testament.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

After endeavoring to establish that the literal predictions of the Old Testament were only an "adumbration" of a "moral

quickenings," and making the whole subject as *shadowy* as possible, he comes to the conclusion that this doctrine is only "darkly intimated" there; and then proceeds to test the "*elasticity*" of the "import" of the language of the New Testament. As he has made the question so "obscure," he argues, that Christ's great mission would be to "bring *life* and *immortality* to light;" and proceeds to the question, "in what manner the Divine Teacher would *be apt* to promulgate to the Jews," the "doctrine of man's future existence." And as he presumes the Jews knew very little of the doctrine, although our Savior *might* have taught differently, yet he argues that

"The revelations of his word have mainly a moral bearing, and the presumption would doubtless be, in the present case, that the doctrine would be conveyed not so much in the terms of scientific verity—in the technical phrase of a strict and accurate physiology—as in a popular diction that would declare the main fact in an intelligible way, and clothe it with the highest practical efficiency, while at the same time it fell short of scientific exactness."—p. 143.

Now, instead of having "recourse to a *priori* considerations," how Christ "would *be apt*" to communicate instructions, in deciding the import of the instructions he did communicate; we should examine his actual teachings, and judge therefrom how he *did inculcate* truths. But if *we* should reason "*a priori*," we should conclude that he would speak the *truth*. And if he taught "in an *intelligible* way," we should expect he would use language according to its usual acceptation at the time he taught: for otherwise they could have had no "intelligible" ideas of its true import. Again, if his mission was to "bring life and immortality to light," we should expect his teachings would be enveloped in no shadowy and obscure diction: for that would be darkening counsel by words without knowledge. *We* should therefore conclude that as a Divine Teacher, he would speak to men in the language of men, so that those who sat on the green grass, the sea-shore, or on the mountain top listening to his instructions, would not be necessitated to carry symbolical dictionaries under their arms, to enable them to understand the import of his teachings;—but that his teachings would be so plain and simple that none need misunderstand him.

Professor Bush next argues, that the "import of the word resurrection, as used in the New Testament," is "simply that of a future existence. He then proceeds to a consideration of

"THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST."

As the doctrine of the resurrection of the saints is based upon the resurrection of Christ, it becomes necessary, in disproving a material resurrection, to prove that Christ did not arise "in his material body:"—as Professor Bush says, "As he in his risen body, stands at the head of his saints, so the fact of his resurrection occupies a like relation to the fact of theirs." He admits "the *fact*" "of his emergence from the sepulchre on the third day;" and also that "if he actually rose in his *material* body—in the self same body in which he was crucified—it doubtless affords some countenance to the idea that his people are also to rise in like manner in the bodies which they laid down at death." Yet even then he thinks "his resurrection is to be regarded as a pledge," and not "as a *pattern* of their resurrection;" because "his body did not see corruption, while theirs do."

The bodies of all will not see corruption. Those who may die three days before their resurrection, will not. But it is their bodies that are not to be in *death* like his, and which in the resurrection are to be made like his glorious body. But to his argument. And

1st, he argues, that it is nowhere explicitly affirmed, "that the identical material body of Christ arose." And

2d, "that the same body which arose, ascended;" but "that it was not a material body that ascended."

As he has offered no particular proof on this point, we proceed to the next consideration.

3d. That the manner of his appearing to his disciples indicates a spiritual body.—He entered and stood in their midst when the *doors were shut*; and they were terrified and affrighted, thinking they saw a *spirit*, &c.

Now although Christ *convinced* the disciples that he was *not* a *spirit*, saying, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not *flesh* and *bones* as *ye see me have*;"—showed them the "print of the nails" and his wounded "side," and "eat" with them "broiled fish" and a "honey comb;" yet Professor Bush recognizes in it only, "*a miraculous adaptation of the visible phenomena to the outward senses of the disciples.*" His eating, he thinks "was doubtless an *optical* act"—"*appearing* to eat," to convince the disciples of his "identity." The Scriptures, however, affirm that he "*did eat* before them."

Now our Savior either "did eat," or he intentionally *deceived* his disciples by *calling* for "meat," and *appearing* to eat, which, when they were watching him with such intense interest, would have been a *trick* of the veriest *jugglery*, a feat of legerdemain. But he could have had no possible object in thus deceiving them: for if they do not eat in the resurrection he could as easily have stated that fact, as that they do not marry in the resurrection. And they were already convinced of his "identity." Therefore, to *dupe* them by *pretending to eat*, would be derogatory to his character.

By the same process of reasoning, we might conclude that all the circumstances of Christ's birth and life were only "a miraculous adaptation of the visible phenomena to the outward senses" of the Jews. Thus, we might deny his incarnation, as well as his resurrection. His fasting forty days, his walking on the sea, his being transported from the temple to the mountain, and his transfiguration, would as soon demonstrate that he never possessed a material body, as do the arguments which are adduced to prove that he did not rise with such. All his miracles might also be explained away as "optical acts;" and even his crucifixion might be regarded as an "appearance." Such, however, was not the faith of the early Christians. Says Ignatius, a disciple of John the Evangelist, and a martyr, Christ "was condemned, was crucified, truly, not seemingly, nor in appearance, nor by deception, he died truly, and was buried, and was raised from the dead."

If Professor Bush lays so little stress upon a positive declaration here, we wonder that he should lay any stress upon his objection, that it is no where positively said his body was raised!!! Doubting Thomas rendered himself proverbial for his unbelief. Yet no one will question that he was finally *fully satisfied* that he beheld and handled the identical body that was nailed to the cross. But it would seem, from the reasoning of Professor Bush, that had *he* been one of the twelve, the unbelief of Thomas would have been entirely eclipsed. We will suppose the Professor had been present; would the Savior have convinced him as he did Thomas? Certainly not. He would have required some more "philosophical" evidence, than merely handling the Savior, beholding the identical wounds by which he died, or the positive declaration, that "*a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.*" Nor would his *eating* have been any evidence; it would be only an *optical* delusion! How then

could he be convinced, while rejecting the evidence of all his senses? Alas! can he regard all this as only an *appearance*?

But shall we regard the difficulty of his entering the room, when the door was shut, as counterbalancing all these evidences? We have no evidence that the same body may not be raised, and yet be so changed in its capacities, as not to be deterred by obstacles which would have prevented ingress, while in the mortal state. And, also, it is evident that the fact of the doors being shut, is recorded, not that it is so wonderful that he entered while they were closed, as that they were in great fear of the Jews, and therefore met with closed doors. It is therefore possible he made his ingress in the usual way. But *if* his eating was only an *appearance* of eating, might not his entrance with closed doors have been only an *appearance*? That "rule" ought surely to work both ways. Or might not the disciples have been so engaged as not to observe the manner of his entrance, beholding him first in their midst? But, says the Professor, our "Lord did not ascend in a material body," and therefore it was not raised or "he must have put it off, either at the ascension itself, or at some time previous, during the forty days of his sojourning on earth, of the proof of which we have not the slightest trace, except what is involved in the hypothesis itself." But we might add, that "we have not the slightest trace" of evidence, that his material body did not ascend. He has as yet presented none.

Another objection he adduces is, that Mary mistook Christ for a gardener, so that he must have had on the garments of one, while his own clothes had been divided among the soldiers, and his grave clothes lay wrapped together. "Whence then, did he obtain his garments?"

We may not know how he obtained them; and yet they might have been obtained in a thousand ways, without the resort to a miracle; or they might have been miraculously furnished. But as God has not seen fit to reveal this to us, it can be no ground of objection, unless it can be *proved* that there could have been no possible way of obtaining them. But there is no evidence that Mary supposed he was a gardener from his dress. She was overwhelmed with sorrow and grief, supposing that her Lord had been taken away, she knew not where; and seeing a man in the garden, she concluded at once he was the gardener. And while weeping,

on hearing the word Mary fall from the Savior's lips, "she turned herself" and at once recognized the Lord. But, says Professor Bush,

"We are still firm in the belief, that the impression is far more spontaneous, that the whole was miraculous, the *apparent* body as well as the *apparent* garb."—p.156.

Such is his confidence in the *elasticity* of the import of language! He then argues that he appeared in different forms, ascended several times to heaven during the forty days, &c. &c., as proof of his spiritualism. But if his material body could ascend *once*, it *might* many times; and therefore, even if he could establish those propositions, which are *far* from being *demonstrated*, we cannot see that it would affect the materiality of his body.

He thinks "the body which hung upon the cross was miraculously dissolved or resolved into its primitive elements, like that of Elijah when he was translated. But this is only an assumption respecting Elijah. We nowhere read of Elijah's body falling down from mid-heaven upon the head of Elisha, as it must have done had it been dissipated only by "natural causes," by which Professor Bush argues God usually labors. It was only his mantle that Elisha saw fall. If his body was parted from him in his ascent, there would have been some propriety in the request of the sons of the prophets to go and seek for it, "lest, peradventure, the Spirit of the Lord hath taken him up, and cast him upon some mountain or into some valley."—2 Kings ii. 16.

The translation of Elijah must have been of the same character as was that of Enoch; and we are expressly told, Heb. xi. 5, that he "was translated that he should not *see death*; and was not found, *because* God had translated him." Now if in being translated his spiritual body was eliminated from his corporeal system, and its material dissipated into invisibility, he must as much have tasted of death, although in a different manner, as any do who die: for, according to Professor Bush's hypothesis, on the death of each person there is a like spiritual body eliminated and disconnected from the grosser material. The reason that Enoch "was not found" was, "because God had translated him." Now if the ascent to heaven of his material body was not necessary, his translation would have been no reason for the absence of his body; that might have still remained. But that reason being given, proves its ascension also. He says:—

"We may admit indeed that the disciples supposed that the body which they saw and handled, was the veritable body of their crucified Lord, and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea than that of the re-animation of his body of flesh."—p. 165.

This is admitting that the resurrection of the body was a part of the faith once delivered to the saints, and for which we are commanded earnestly to contend.

But if there was no necessary connection between the disappearing of his body from the tomb, and his resurrection, why should it have been removed from the sepulchre? why not suffered to moulder away by the effect of "*natural causes*?"

Ah, they might have "worshipped his body!" Why then did they not worship it during the "three days?" But, he asks:—

"How could they have been adequately convinced of his being actually alive, of his ascension and glorification, while they could, at any time, by going there, have seen him with the eye of sense, dead in the tomb? How much, moreover, would the ministry of the first preachers of the Gospel have been embarrassed in the proclamation of the great fact of the resurrection, if his body had remained visible, or the mode of its removal been commonly known? Could the Jewish or Gentile gainsayer be expected to yield credence to the declaration, that Jesus had risen from the dead, and was still alive, when both his tomb and his body could at any time be pointed out, as yet remaining with them?"—p. 167.

We agree with the Professor, that had his body remained, the disciples could not have been convinced, nor could they have convinced others of his resurrection; and this is conclusive proof that in teaching the resurrection, they taught the *resurrection of the body*. If the resurrection is only the elimination of the inner from the outer man at death,—if it is barely a *future existence*, the presence of the body would have been no hindrance in the way of convincing men of its truth: the Jews believed in that already; but they were grieved because they taught the resurrection of the dead. Even the refined Athenians, to whom Paul preached in "the midst of Mars-hill," did not reject the doctrine of a future state; but "when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked;" and all thought it a "strange thing" he brought to their ears. We read in Luke xxiv. 3—6, when they went to the sepulchre "and found not the *body* of the Lord Jesus," they "were much perplexed thereabout;" and the angels relieved their perplexity about the *body*, by assuring them, "he is not here, but is risen." If the body was not risen, there was no pertinency in the answer the angels gave.

It, therefore, is evident, that the angels also believed in the resurrection of the body. Again we read, that the only answer the Jews could make to the fact of Christ's resurrection, was, that "his disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept."—Matt. xxviii. 13. They argued that the disciples, to make them believe in Christ's resurrection, stole away his body. Professor Bush argues, that God stole away his body, to induce the disciples to believe it!! But Christ died to bring life and immortality to light.—All but the Sadducees were already satisfied of a future existence.—The result was, that those who received this light, embraced fully the belief of the resurrection of the body. But if the body is not raised, he shrouded the whole question in still grosser darkness. Consequently the death and resurrection of Christ fully establishes the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

The question of the resurrection of Christ's body seems to be fully settled by Paul, in 1 Cor. xv. 1—8. He affirms that the "faith" which they "received," and by which they were to be saved, was, that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Now the spiritual body, in which Professor Bush supposes Christ was eliminated from his crucified body, could not have been buried; for, upon his hypothesis, it emerges from the physical structure at death. Consequently, when it is said, "Christ died and was buried," it can only have reference to his flesh which was not to see corruption; and, therefore, when it is said he rose again, it must include the flesh that was buried. It is this which must have arisen the third day; for if his resurrection pertained only to what was eliminated at death, he would have risen the first day, even before his burial! But Paul affirms, that "he was buried," and "he"—i. e., what was buried, "rose again the third day." His promise to the thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise"—the world of spirits—proves that his Divinity, the uncreated Word, "whose goings forth have been from everlasting," (Micah v. 2,) was not laid in the grave: but "his soul was not left in *Hades*, neither did his flesh see corruption:" both were raised again on the third day.

The evidence of the elimination of a spiritual body from his material body at death, would not have depended upon its subsequent visibility. And yet Paul here rests the evi-

dence of it entirely upon the fact, that "he," who was buried, "was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve," and after that "of above five hundred brethren at once," after that of "James," then "of all the apostles," and "last of all," Paul says, "he was seen of me also." Now if his body was not raised, and they saw nothing but an *apparition*, all this testimony of his being *seen*, is entirely irrelevant, and no proof at all of his resurrection; so that he may still not be raised, upon Professor Bush's hypothesis, as we have no evidence but this to the contrary.

"EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR PASSAGES" IN THE NEW
TESTAMENT.

Having satisfactorily disposed of the resurrection of Christ, Professor Bush proceeds to dispose of the resurrection of the saints. The first portion of Scripture he *adumbrates*, is that in 1 Cor. xv. 12—53. He first premises,—to which we agree,—that the resurrection here spoken of "*pertains exclusively to the righteous*." Respecting verses 12 and 13, he argues, that if they refer to a *future* resurrection, Paul reasons "in a circle." He cannot see how "the future resurrection of the saints is proved by the *past* resurrection of Christ," or how "the *past* resurrection of Christ, is proved by the *future* resurrection of his people." But if it "takes place with every individual believer as soon as he leaves the body," "this logical inconsistency is avoided."

Is it not very evident that the Professor has here misapprehended Paul's argument? The argument seems to be this: If *none* of the dead are raised, Christ cannot be raised. If *one* is raised, it cannot be true that there is *no* resurrection of the dead. Therefore, "if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of the dead? But if there be *no* resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen:" for *no* resurrection would preclude *all*, so that even Christ could not be raised. If the question in dispute was a future existence, there would be no *logic* about it. For Professor Bush admits that Christ's *actual* spiritual body was *invisible*, and that all the disciples saw was only an *appearance*. If so, they did not have a particle of proof that Christ was risen; and, therefore, it would not prove the dead would rise. But as a future existence was not disputed by the Jews, the resurrection of the body alone could be the subject of controversy.

Verses 16—18. The Professor comments upon the 18th verse, "Then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" and asks how that follows, "provided there was no resurrection of the body? Their *souls*, the true constituent of *themselves*, were certainly in being, and what should prevent their *souls* being saved, even if their bodies did not rise?"—p. 170.

Professor Bush would not have asked these questions, had he attended closely to Paul's *logic*. We read in Rom. iv. 25, that Christ "was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." If, therefore, Christ was not raised, no flesh could be justified in the sight of God, and all must perish. The wicked will perish; and if no flesh could be justified, all would be left to experience their fate: for they would still be in their sins. So Paul argues in the 17th verse of the chapter under consideration, which Professor Bush passed over without comment. Says Paul, "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins." "Then"—that is, consequently,—arriving at a conclusion predicated upon the proposition, that if Christ is not raised, "ye are yet in your sins,"—"they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. Why? *Ans.*—They would still be in their sins.

On verses 20—23, he contends, that the idea is not that Christ rose first in point of *time*; but the first in *rank*. And that every man's rising "in his own order," is, "as he dies,"—all along through time. But Paul has himself shown us what he means by "every man in his own order,"—the last part of that text being exegetical of the former. He explains it as, "Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Professor Bush argues, as the harvest comes immediately after the first fruits, that a long time could not elapse between the resurrection of Christ and that of his redeemed. But we reply, the harvest is not continued all through the year: it is reaped at the appropriate time. And as the antitype is greater than the type, so may the time between be proportionally greater. We are told that the harvest is at the end of the world; but Professor Bush would extend the harvest, even from the beginning!

Verses 35—37. "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up! and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain; it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain."

When St. Paul wrote the prediction of the above questions which would be asked respecting the resurrection of the body, it is to be presumed that he little suspected questions so similar would be asked by a learned Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in the New York city University !! Says St. Paul, some man will say, "How are the dead raised up?" Says Professor Bush, "How—in what sense—are these bodies to be raised?"—p. 49.—"How is the body to be forthcoming at the appointed time?"—p. 52. Says St. Paul, some man will say, "With what body do they come?" Says Professor Bush, "What body is to be raised?"—p. 37. "It leaves us under the irresistible prompting to inquire, what body?" "What body is intended?"—p. 55. These, and similar questions which we find frequently propounded throughout the work, have so striking a resemblance to the questions Paul predicted would be asked, that one given to *fanciful* interpretations of Scripture, might suppose them a fulfillment of that prediction. But we only set it down as a "striking coincidence." St. Paul may be considered by some to be rather indecorous in the answer he gives to Professor Bush and others who ask questions of this nature. But Paul was not probably aware of the extent to which "science" would disprove the "letter" of the Scriptures, or how "elastic" their "import" might be found; and as he could not have had Professor Bush within the scope of his prophetic vision, he must be excused for any seeming disrespect. And, we can assure the Professor, that according to his own rule it is only "*apparent*." But should any contend that the legitimate construction of the text necessitates us to such an application, we would remind them that the Professor has already shown that when the body of Christ was dissipated in the sepulchre and resolved into its original elements, the apostles were actually so *fool-ish*, they really "*supposed*" that the body which they saw and handled, was the veritable body of their crucified Lord, and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea than that of the re-animation of his body of flesh,"—p. 165, and actually supposed they saw him eat. And, also, that sometimes Paul's "reasoning, so to speak, does not rise above the surface of the ground.—p. 176, and "is little more than mere reasoning in a circle."—p. 170. He also says, in reference to the selection of the germinating of a grain of wheat, as illustrative of the resurrection, that

"In the *present state* of our scientific knowledge, it might perhaps appear that an analogy drawn from insect transmutations would have been still more striking; but *it may be questioned* whether the facts in this province of nature *were known* to the *apostle*, and at any rate, the law of vegetable re-production to which he refers, is sufficiently apropos to his main design."—p. 175.

Paul being thus shown to be *deficient* in knowledge himself, the Professor might retort the same epithet upon the apostle.

The inference which Professor Bush draws from these texts is, that

"Nothing is more certain, than that the apostle intended distinctly to teach, that as the grain of wheat obtains a new body only by previously dying, so man, by undergoing a similar process, becomes possessed in like manner of a new investment." "In regard to the grain, he affirms, 'Thou sowest not the body that shall be.' What is the correlative to this, unless it be, that the body that dies is not the same body that shall be at, or after the resurrection?"—p. 179.

To this we reply, that in a certain sense, the body is not the same: it is changed—is remodeled. And that this is all he means by its not being the same, is evident from the next verse, where he says, "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and *to every seed HIS OWN BODY.*" Professor Bush presents a long argument respecting the germination of seeds, and shows that the body cannot thus *sprout*,—having no "*Luz—ossiculum Luz*"* by which to germinate, no unbroken "link of connection between it and the resurrection body," &c.; therefore,

"As the plant emerges from the seed by the expansion of the germ, by the uninterrupted action of the vital principle, so the spiritual body must develop itself immediately, by the continuous operation of a like agency?"—p. 180.

All this is upon the supposition that the resurrection, if the body is raised, depends upon some germinating principle in the buried dust. But this has been fully answered in the review of that part of the argument which is derived from reason. We will here only observe, that if he would thus closely press the comparison, he would be obliged to admit that the body raised is a material body, and of the same nature as the one deposited in the ground.

Verses 38—41. "A moment's reflection," says Professor Bush, "will convince us that by 'giving to every seed his own body,' is meant nothing

* "The Jewish name for a bone which they supposed was in every human body, immortal and indestructible."

more than his *giving to every seed a body peculiar to that kind of seed*. A seed of wheat does not produce a stalk of barley, nor a seed of barley a stalk of wheat. The species are kept distinct by a mysterious arrangement of Providence." And, therefore, as there are different kinds of bodies, "man may have a different body fitted to the different state in which he enters at death,"—and "though the natural body should rise no more, yet provision has been made for his being furnished with a better in its stead; for as there is an earthly body adapted to an earthly life, so there is a heavenly body adapted to a heavenly life."—p. 183.

But if a seed of barley cannot produce a stalk of wheat, how can a material body produce an ethereal one? It must certainly be like the one sown, but adapted to its future condition.

Verses 42—44. Professor Bush argues that the *sowing* referred to, is not "by being deposited in the grave;" but that "it is sown at its *birth*, and not at its *death*." Also, that this is not a "resurrection of *the* body, although it is doubtless of *a* body." He further adds:—

"But to our mind it is clear, that the fact of its being *incorruptible*, proves that it cannot be the same with that which is *corruptible*, and that nothing now is meant than that the corruptible shall be *exchanged* for the incorruptible, the mortal for the immortal."—p. 187.

Upon this principle, the *seed* is *planted* when it is formed in the head of the stalk, and not when it is deposited in the ground! The language of the text is to us very positive, that IT which is sown will be raised. But may not that which is corruptible become incorruptible? The apostle assures us, that we shall all be *changed*,—not "*ex*-changed;" and when this change has passed upon us, we shall no more be the corruptible body we now are, than is the diamond the easily pulverized body it would be, if in the form of charcoal, although it would be the same material.

Verses 50—53. "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

Says Professor Bush:—

"We here encounter a great difficulty in view of our previous position, that the true resurrection takes place at the death of every individual believer, when he emerges from a material into a spiritual body. Is it not clearly implied, not to say expressly asserted, in this passage, that the resurrection of all the righteous is simultaneous, and that this event is still future, to occur at the epoch of the second advent, and in conjunction with the translation of the living saints?"

We can of course have no object in denying or disguising the fact, that these words have very much the air of directly contravening the general tenor of our interpretation of the preceding portions of this chapter. Still, if our previous train of reasoning be sound—if our conclusions be fairly sustained by the evidence adduced—it is certain that these words, *rightly understood*, cannot be in conflict with them."—pp. 190, 191.

Would it not have been more logical to have remarked, that if our previous reasoning *had been* sound, these words would not have been in conflict with it? For one rule which we have adopted, is, that if any theory is contradicted by the literal rendering of a single text, it must be fallacious; and that a scriptural view of any subject will harmonize with the entire word of God. Professor Bush is, however, "so strongly persuaded of the truth of" his "previous conclusions," that his "confidence in them is no wise shaken by the literal reading of a passage, which seems at first view to enforce entirely another theory."—p. 191.

He then endeavors to justify his position, by showing that the Jews were looking to the period "called 'the last day'—'the world to come'—'the reign of the Messiah,' when a new order of things was to be ushered in, among which was to be the event, denominated *the resurrection of the dead*," when there would be "an indefinite period of peace, prosperity, and happiness, from the rising to the going down of the sun,"—that this forms "the burden of a multitude of the Old Testament prophecies," which the Jews "applied to his first advent," but which we know "belong to his second." He then proceeds:—

"Now it is unquestionable that our Lord, in predicting his second coming, Matt. 24 and 25, does in reality announce, in accordance with Dan. vii. 15—28, the same great era, though it is essentially interwoven with the tissue of his predictions respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, and that *appearing* which was to take place during the life time of the men of that generation."—p. 192.

He farther argues that our Lord's predictions are "but the application of numerous Old Testament prophecies," and "were the foundation of all the knowledge which the apostles possessed respecting the Lord's second coming;" and adds:—

"Thus the remarkable passage, 1 Thess. iv. 15—17, is but a paraphrase of Christ's prediction, Matt. xxiv. 29—34, whence he introduces it by stating, 'This we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*.' Consequently, if the true meaning of the symbolic language in which our Lord delivered his predictions, was not made known to the apostles, of which their writings afford no evidence, they would naturally interpret them according to the letter, and suppose a speedy fulfillment." "What then more nat-

ural, nay, unless expressly informed to the contrary, what more inevitable, than that they should have cherished the expectation, that they should themselves behold the Lord appear in the clouds of heaven, and be themselves caught up to meet him in the air."—p. 193.

He then quotes Gibbon as saying, that the "primitive church" were "in their day," expecting the "literal fulfillment" of these prophecies. He also quotes from Dr. Watts an argument to show from the writings of the apostles, that "they imagined the day of resurrection and judgment was very near;" and therefore, "labored under a mistake on that point,"—not understanding the full import of all the Holy Spirit spake by them. But, says Professor Bush:—

"We contend," "that it does not truly detract from Paul's claims to inspiration, that he should not have understood what was not revealed, or that he should have so stated what was revealed, as to evince that he had, in some respects, mistaken its true purport—that he should have put upon it a sense which we now know to be erroneous."—p. 197.

In the above quotations it is admitted that the apostles understood the advent of Christ to be literal and personal, and that such a coming was the faith delivered to the saints. But we find no evidence presented that the language in which those predictions are clothed, is otherwise than strictly *literal*. Or that the apostles were *mistaken* in the nature of the advent, or as he claims, that that was at the destruction of Jerusalem. Nor do we find evidence that the apostles were looking for his second coming in their day. All the various texts spoken by our Lord or his apostles, that refer to that event as being then near, it will be seen by an examination of their context, were spoken in reference to other events which were previously to transpire; and when they should have been fulfilled, the advent would *then* be "quickly," in "a little while," &c., &c. The over-looking of this simple fact, has led many into the error of supposing that the apostles believed the second advent would be in their day—although some of these very persons believe the apostles taught one thousand years must transpire before the Lord could come! But Peter assures us that the Lord had showed him how he must put off this tabernacle; and Paul affirms that that day will not come, except the Man of sin be revealed—the Papacy. While, therefore, we admit the primitive church believed in the event as near, there is no evidence that the apostles were of the same opinion.

The Professor then argues that

"The apostle in the present instance, discloses the grand fundamental fact, that at the time to which the Holy Spirit refers, there should be a

translation of the living saints." "But we have no evidence that the precise time of this event was any where made known, and therefore it was to be expected that Paul should assign it to that epoch which he supposed to be intended when our Savior said, that 'this generation shall not pass away till all these things shall be fulfilled.'"—p. 199.

Now there is as much evidence that the connection of this change with Christ's appearing is the teaching of inspiration, as that the change itself is. The phrase, "this generation," by which it is assumed that Christ's coming was during the generation then living, we are satisfied affords no proof of the kind. In the 24th of Matt. where this famous text is found, the context shows us that our Savior had given to his disciples a prediction extending to his advent. He then gives them the signs which were to precede his coming, and which were to be after the long tribulation of those days of persecution which commenced at the destruction of Jerusalem, and extended through the Papal persecutions. Thus having taken the disciples in prophetic vision, down to the very signs which were to indicate his coming and the end of the world, he assures them that "this generation"—the generation of which he was last speaking—"will not pass away" until all is fulfilled. This is the only exposition we have seen that would harmonize that chapter with itself; and this view of it harmonizes with St Paul's connection of the Advent with the translation of the living saints. But says the Professor:—

"We well know by what criticisms upon the word 'generation,' it is attempted to rebut the force of the natural construction, and make it harmonize with an accomplishment that should first ensue hundreds or thousands of years after the life-time of the disciples. But after all, it is impossible to explain away the native and genuine import of the phrase."—p. 199.

It is really amusing, to see how *suddenly* the Professor has become a great stickler for "*the native and genuine import of the phrase.*" He entirely rejects what he himself admits to be the "native and genuine import" of Paul's assertion, that this change is to be at Christ's appearing; and also the letter of the Scriptures whenever they speak of the resurrection; but lo, here we must abide by the *native import*—because his construction of it makes Christ's advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But if, as Professor Bush says, the word "fulfilled" should rather be, "begin to occur," why, upon his own reasoning, may not Christ's advent—one of the last events in that prediction—be "after a long tract of

centuries," as well as the termination of the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, which the Professor thus locates in the future, and which in the prediction precedes that of the Advent? It may most certainly. And consequently, we must abide by Paul's construction.

Again, speaking of this change, he says:—

"It is to come to pass at the period so frequently alluded to in the prophets, as to be distinguished by something that is here termed the 'sounding of the last trumpet;' and as this is doubtless identical with the last in the series of the seven Apocalyptic trumpets, Rev. xi. 17, which announces the downfall of earthly dominion, and the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, it is clear that it cannot refer to what is technically termed 'the end of the world,' so far as that phrase is to imply the physical destruction of the globe. For the sounding of the seventh trumpet is not a signal of the *close*, but rather of the *commencement* of that last grand phasis of the kingdom of Christ, which is the theme of the most enrapturing strains of all the prophets.—p. 201.

He then contends that this "change" will be going on forever, and not be a "*simultaneous translation*;" but acting on all, as they are individually affected, "in the twinkling of an eye."

We need not inform Professor Bush that the "end of the *world*" in the Scriptures, is literally "the end of the *age*;" and that it is in this sense we use it. We, therefore, no more look for the end of the *globe* at the last trump, than does the Professor; and with him we admit, that it is the *commencement* of the "last phasis" of the "kingdom of Christ." But there are several difficulties in the way of understanding his conclusion that this change is not to be "*simultaneous*," but continuing indefinitely, which he sustains by no *evidence*. 1. The text positively asserts that "we shall all be changed" "at the last trump," which John explains to be, "when it shall begin to sound." 2. We are assured, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." And as this is the last phasis of this kingdom, no one can enter it until they have passed this change. Consequently there will, during its continuance, be no subjects for this change, so that they must all be changed at its commencement. 3. The apostle, in another place, makes a distinction between those "who sleep," and "we who are alive and remain," who will "not sleep." Upon the Professor's hypothesis of the spiritual body, there can be no distinction made between the living and the dead: for all finally sleep, and all are alike changed, and the commencement of this change, according to his own theory, would be fulfilling as much in all time before the last

trump, as afterwards. We must, therefore, notwithstanding all Paul's *fool*-ishness, abide by the exposition of the Apostle, in preference to that of the Professor. We, however, excepting the nature of the events, agree with the Professor in the following :—

"Nothing in our view is clearer than the events commonly assigned to what is termed, by one of the grossest philological errors, 'the end of the world,' i. e., as implying the physical conflagration of the globe, do, in fact, occur at the commencement, and not at the close of the grand Sabatism of the world—for it has no close, i. e., none revealed."—p. 201.

On this point we cannot find room for a question, or a doubt. The whole scope of the Scriptures testify that the "*resurrection*," the "*advent*," the "*conflagration*," &c., are at the commencement of a new and more sublime *age*—"the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." We therefore argue that those who *spiritualize* the reign of Christ on earth, must, from the necessity of the case, deny any personal *advent*, *resurrection* of the dead, burning of the world, or final judgment. These are all intimately connected, and must be alike literal, or alike spiritual. Consequently the church, to be consistent, must embrace Professor Bush's views of the resurrection, or admit the Scriptural doctrine of the literal and personal pre-millennial advent of Christ and his reign on earth. We can see no escape from one of these conclusions, only by refusing to examine the question, or by refusing to admit the evidence.

Matt. v. 29, 30. He endeavors to escape the conclusion, that the body will be raised and cast into hell, by the argument that hell is only the emblem of hell, and not hell itself; and that if a part is emblematical, all is.

But if it was only an emblem, it must have been an emblem of a *reality*, and consequently the body must be raised to suffer there.

Matt. x. 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul : but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."

He evades this *positive* declaration, by the assumption that

"Neither this, nor any other text, bearing upon the life after death, can be explained in disregard of the results which we have previously reached. If these results address themselves, upon their own evidence, with irresistible force to our convictions, it is impossible that the mind, constituted as it is, can receive a declaration in conflict with them. We admit, indeed, the possibility that our conclusions on this head may not be true. We would simply affirm, that *if they are true*, of which every one must judge for him-

self, they will imperatively govern our construction of particular passages which carry a contrary import in their letter."—p. 205.

This is very cavalierly disposing of the difficulty in this passage of Scripture. Upon this principle, the whole Bible might be set aside! and it is upon this principle that the infidel not only rejects the *letter*, but the *spirit* of the entire word—assuming that the declarations of reason are valid, and consequently set aside all opposing declarations of the word of God. We, however, trust we have shown that his argument from reason is inconclusive; and consequently it cannot affect the letter of this text.

Matt. xxii. 31, 32. "But, as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

This he argues proves only that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were alive when God declared himself their God. And that as our Savior uses the resurrection as denoting a future state, it is in the other instances to be used in that sense. He also claims that a future state was the great truth the Sadducees denied, and that unless our Savior's answer had respect to that, it would be irrelevant.

It is true the Sadducees disbelieved in angel, spirit, a resurrection, or a future state. But as the Jews believed the saints did not enter heaven until the resurrection, but were until then in an intermediate state, the question which the Sadducees asked respecting the woman, whose wife of seven husbands she would be, could only have respect to the resurrection. And as they denied either "angel or *spirit*," the great difficulty to them in the way of the resurrection of the dead, was their disbelief in any existence after death, so that if the fathers were to be raised at all, it would be a new creation, and not a resurrection. But when God assured Moses that he was *then* the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, showing that they still lived,—as he is not the God of the dead but of the living—it set aside their great argument against the resurrection of the dead. There is, however, still farther evidence that the resurrection of their bodies is brought to view in this declaration. For God also assured Moses that he had established his "covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers."—Ex. vi. 4. And for them to inherit this land, they must be raised from the dead.

Matt. xxvii. 50—53. He argues that the bodies of the saints which here arose,

"Disappeared immediately upon what is termed their 'rising,' and were seen no more; for the supposition is to us utterly incredible that these material bodies were the objects beheld by those to whom the subsequent appearance was made."—p. 215.

"It was, in the main, an invisible resurrection of the saints."—p. 218.

"We do not suppose that, strictly speaking, they did now first arise."—*Ib.*

"The design was to put forth to the senses of men, a visible effect" of what "was going on in the spiritual world."—*Ib.*

The above are a strange mass of contradictions. They remind us of the "*oppositions* of science!" "Their bodies were raised to show what was going on in the invisible world; and yet their bodies vanished as soon as raised, and were not seen, and of course afforded no evidence of the act then transpiring; but there were *apparitions* which were taken for those bodies, and were an outward evidence of the spiritual resurrection; yet it was an *invisible* resurrection; and finally, 'strictly speaking,' there was no resurrection of any kind then taking place!" This, as near as we can analyze it, is the sum of the argument. And, "if it is sound reasoning," it is proof conclusive. Truly the Professor is reduced to great "extremities of solution!"

In answer to the question, Why, if the bodies did not *appear*, are they said to be raised? he replies that "the language of the Scriptures is constructed very much" "in reference to the impressions made on the senses." Therefore, as they appeared to be raised, it is so written! But we ask, why should there be such an appearance? He answers that the souls of departed saints enter heaven by the merits of Christ; and,—

"Was it not as important to bring their resurrection and glorification into connection with his, as it is to bring ours into that connection? And how could this be externally evidenced to living men, but by some visible effect produced upon their visible bodies? The simple *appearing* of spiritual bodies might indeed have tended to this result, but it would not carry with it that conviction which would arise from some obvious connection of the spiritual bodies with the material."—p. 219.

Now if their resurrection could only be evidenced to living men, by an *appearance* of the resurrection of the body, it proves that the body must be raised to produce a resurrection. For if the body is not raised, to produce an *appearance* to induce men to believe that it is raised in order to convince them of a spiritual resurrection, is a *deception*.

We therefore must dissent from the conclusion of our author, that this "affords no adequate proof of the general theory of the *resurrection of the body*, but rather the reverse." He farther remarks :—

"We are not without strong impressions that Peter's allusion to Christ's going and 'preaching to the spirits in prison' after he was put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, will yet receive its solution from the very passage which we are now considering."—p. 219.

"The suggestion has occurred to us, that as the true sense of 'preaching' is simply 'proclaiming,' the idea might be, that the Savior's spirit went into the world of spirits, the common receptacle of the departed, and there simply *proclaimed* or *announced* the fact of his having conquered death in dying, and of his being about to accomplish a glorious resurrection, which should be available to consummate the hopes of the patriarchs and saints, who had died in the faith of a blessed immortality, which as it depended upon Christ's redemption-work, it could not be *fully* enjoyed until he had lived, died, risen, and ascended."—p. 220.

The first difficulty that suggests itself to the above is, How could the Savior proclaim that he had conquered death before his resurrection? His dying was certainly no proof of death's being conquered! Death was then the conqueror, and gained the victory over him. But when he arose from the dead and could not be holden by the "grim monster," then he could exclaim, "O death where is thy victory?"

We are, however, constrained to give an entirely different application of the words of Peter. He assures us that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit :—" "by which also he went and preached unto the spirits [now] in prison ;" i. e., he preached to them by the spirit. The question then is, When did he preach to them? Ans. Not while they were in prison, where they are bound in "chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment ;"—but he preached to them by his Spirit when they were "disobedient" during their probation, "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing," and Noah, a preacher of righteousness was warning them of the approaching deluge.

But even if Professor Bush's explication of Peter was correct, it would not disprove the resurrection of the body.

John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this : for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

He says :—

"This is undoubtedly the strongest passage in the New Testament in favor of the common resurrection ;" and "we cannot fail to perceive that

it is marked by a certain directness of enunciation, in respect to the general subject, which must be considered as strongly countenancing the construction which the Christian world has ever for the most part been led to put upon it."—p. 234.

His arguments against its literal acceptance, are

1. That our Lord "for the most part, speaks of" the resurrection "as the distinguishing privilege and prerogative of the righteous. Thus, Luke xx. 35, 36, 'But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children (sons) of God, *being the children (sons) of the resurrection.*' Here it is clear that the 'children of God,' are identified as the same with the 'children of the resurrection.' Again, Luke xiv. 12—14, when commanding his disciples to call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, to their feasts, he adds, 'And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed *at the resurrection of the just*;' as if the resurrection belonged emphatically to the just. In strict accordance with this, the apostle expresses himself, Phil. iii. 11, 'If by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection of the dead.*'"—p. 235.

Now all the force there is in the above objection, is in the *supposition* in accordance with the *modern* belief that the resurrection of the righteous and wicked are co-etaneous. And if the resurrection which all will attain unto is alluded to in these passages, they would be meaningless. The Bible, however, teaches no such co-etaneous resurrection of both classes.—It is everywhere in accordance with the faith of the primitive church, that "the dead in Christ will rise first"—that they will be raised, "Christ the first fruits, afterwards they which are his at his coming," &c. Even some of the very texts which have been examined, are rendered by Professor Bush as referring to the resurrection of the righteous only. So that there is a resurrection unto which the wicked cannot attain. Now if all are raised, how is this explained? It is by the fact that there are two resurrections,—that of the righteous, being distinguished as The Resurrection, which is the resurrection referred to in all such and kindred texts. In Rev. xx. 4—6, John says the martyrs, &c., "lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the First Resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the First Resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." It is the rejection of this positive prediction, by which the true doctrine of the resurrection is here presented, that has given place to the idea that it is a simultaneous event with both classes. And

because there are so many passages which cannot be reconciled with its being a co-etaneous event, it is adduced as an argument for entirely rejecting the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. But with this view, those same texts become the strong bulwark of this doctrine.

2. His second consideration against the literal interpretation of this text, is "the cumulative mass of evidence, built upon rational and philosophical grounds" against *any* resurrection of the *body*; but which he dare not "by any means affirm" is conclusive. As we have seen its inconclusiveness, it ceases to "have weight."

He again brings forth the old objection that *all* the dead cannot issue from their graves, when "the clearest induction of reason" assures us that "millions of bodies," "once deposited in those graves are no longer there;" to believe which, he declares "is a downright crucifixion of reason." This objection, however, is not valid; for the text only asserts that "*all that are in the graves shall come forth.*" It is not "all shall come forth from graves," nor "all who were once in," but "all who are in." Instead of following the simple letter of the text, he adds to it what it does not assert, and then because this addition would "crucify reason to believe it," he rejects the text itself!

But he finds a new dilemma, that this "is not so much now a conflict between Revelation and Reason, as it is an *apparent conflict between one part of Revelation and another.*"—p. 237. He has, however, presented no portion of Revelation which conflicts with the text, so that we proceed to his

3d argument. This is the "*accommodation*" principle of interpretation, which accommodates the Bible to every absurdity imaginable. Upon this principle, he supposes the Savior is only quoting Dan. xii. 2; and he asks:—

"Why is it not sufficient to understand him as saying in effect, 'Marvel not at what I have just said, for the time is coming when the event predicted by the prophet Daniel, whatever or whenever it shall be, shall be accomplished, and that too through my agency, to whom the Father hath given a quickening power, however lightly my claims may now be regarded.'"—p. 240.

To us, that understanding is not sufficient, because we have seen no valid reasons given for it; and the plain letter of the text teaches something more positive and explicit.

John vi. 3, 9, 40. In these texts our Savior promises of

every one who believes in him, that "*I will raise him up at the last day.*" Says Professor Bush :—

"The same declaration in substance or in form, occurs v. 44, 54. It certainly denotes the resurrection of those who believed in him, and, according to the letter, a resurrection within the limits of a certain period, denominated here 'the last day.' An equivalent allusion to this day occurs, xii. 48, 'The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him *at the last day.*' That the expression is conformed to the usual mode in which the resurrection of the righteous was spoken of among the Jews, is also unquestionable. Still we cannot deem ourselves precluded from referring again to the principle, * somewhat fully developed on a previous page, on which many things in our Lord's addresses to the Jews are to be interpreted. It cannot be denied that without sacrificing or compromising any substantial truth, he did still, on many occasions, adopt the style of his discourse to the notions then prevalent, and which were grounded in the main upon the *literal* record of their Scriptures. Although the traditional interpretations put upon these Scriptures were in many instances wrong, yet it obviously did not enter his purposes invariably to set his hearers right in respect to them. Nor can we conceive of his having done so without thereby shocking their prejudices to a degree that would have prevented their reception of his doctrines, not to remark that he could scarcely otherwise have made himself intelligible to them."—pp. 241, 242.

"When our Savior, for instance, says, Matt. xii. 27, 'If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?' are we to suppose that he intended to sanction the common belief, that such exorcisms were actually performed at that time by others than his own disciples? The conceit was rife among the people that such was indeed the case, and our Lord simply adopted the argument *ex concessis*, without intimating whether the popular belief had a ground of truth or not."—p. 244.

"So also in regard to the phrases 'world'—'world to come'—'end of the world'—there is no evidence that he did not employ them as they were generally understood. So in the present case we rest in the conclusion, that our Lord spake on the subject of the resurrection in accordance with the sentiments and the diction then prevalent, and that his words are not to be regarded as a criterion of the *absolute truth* of the current doctrine."—p. 245.

The Professor is certainly reduced to "great extremities of solution," in being necessitated to resort to such an expedient to obviate the literal import of this passage. He admits that here is literally predicted a resurrection of the body; that the Jews at that time understood by such a use of language a literal resurrection; that they believed in such a resurrection, and that this belief was founded upon the literal record of their Scriptures! And what more could be wished to prove the common view from this text? Oh, our Savior's words are not to be regarded as "*absolute truth*," because he could scarcely make "himself intelligible," and it would have been "shocking their prejudices" had he expressed himself

* "The principle of *accommodation*."

otherwise than in accordance with what the Jews then believed !

But if Professor Bush can make himself "intelligible" in teaching the "resurrection," and make use of language in a manner so that no one would suspect that he believed or taught the resurrection of the body ; might not Christ, who "spake as never man spake," have made himself equally "intelligible," in presenting the view that is presented in the volume under consideration, had it been the truth ? No one certainly will claim that our Savior was not as able to express himself intelligibly as Professor Bush !

But he was fearful of shocking the prejudices of the people, and therefore did not correct their errors ! We were not before aware that our Savior ever hesitated to proclaim the truth, however unwelcome it might be to them. He was no fawning sycophant, or flatterer of the Jew. Witness his fearful denunciations of their shameless hypocrisy !—Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ! He denounced them as whited sepulchres, as the descendants of those who killed the prophets, as drawing nigh with their lips, while their hearts were far from God, as blind leaders of the blind, as a wicked and adulterous generation, as payers of tithes of anise, mint and cummin, and neglecters of the weightier matters of the law ! &c.

Nor can it be true that he did not correct their errors of doctrine. They had no idea they were children of the devil ; and yet he assured them such was the fact. He did not hesitate to declare unto them that they worshipped in vain, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," that they "made the word of God of none effect" by their traditions. That does not look like fearing to instruct them contrary to their belief ! On the contrary, we are strongly persuaded, that in all his instructions, where his auditors entertained erroneous views, he aimed to correct them. Thus, when the disciples inquired of the destruction of the temple, his second coming and the end of the world, supposing they were all to transpire together, his immediate reply was, "Take heed that no man deceive you : " they were deceived in thus connecting all those events. When he told his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," and they thought "he had spoken of taking rest in sleep, then said Jesus to them plainly, Lazarus is dead." When he spoke of his death and resurrection under the figure of a temple, its being destroyed and raised up again

in three days, lest he should be misunderstood, it is recorded that "he spake of the temple of his body." And when the Sadducees inquired whose wife, of seven husbands a woman had been married to, she would be in the resurrection, he promptly responded, "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures or the power of God;" and then he proceeds to inform them that in the resurrection they do not marry, but are as the angels. Now if he was fearful of shocking the prejudices of any, and therefore accommodated himself to their opinions; he would, when conversing with the Sadducees respecting the resurrection, have accommodated himself to their belief and taught there was no resurrection, nor angel or spirit; and thus, when instructing different classes, he would have taught different doctrines. But as he always taught the same doctrines, and never *accommodated* himself to the Sadducees, the inference is, that he always spoke the "*absolute truth*," irrespective of the opinions of his hearers.

But says the Professor, he accommodated himself to their opinions when he replied, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" But here our Savior did not assert that their children could cast out devils. He offered no opinion on that point; and therefore, such an illustration is not analogous to a positive declaration. When we are shown any declaration or positive statement, in which respect was had to the notions of the Jews, it will be time enough to admit the principle of "accommodation." But till then we must regard the clear enunciations of our Savior, as words of "*absolute truth*" and verity. Consequently when he affirms that he will raise up his children at the last day, we are constrained to believe that it will be even so.

John xi. 21—26. "This," says the Professor, "is a passage of a similar import with the preceding, and is to be construed on the same principle." It follows then that all which has been said on either side of the preceding passage, is applicable to this also. He argues that Martha "merely echoed the general sentiment of the age;" and though "our Lord does not, indeed, in so many words, assure her that her belief was founded upon an incorrect view of the truth," yet he "designed to correct something that was erroneous" in "her belief."—p. 246.

That which he would correct, seems to be that while Martha fully believed Lazarus would "rise at the last day," yet she had no clear conception that he could then, be raised.

Our Savior, however, convinced her of his ability to raise the dead, and thereby that he would fulfill his word and raise them at the last day, and also of his power to raise the dead at any time, by raising Lazarus when he had been dead four days.

Acts ii. 29—35. The scope of this passage, he contends, is that David is not exalted in the sense that Christ is, and that it has no reference to the resurrection of his body. But we would inquire, if that is the doctrine here taught, how the fact of David's sepulchre's being then with the Jews, could be any evidence of his not having ascended? We are strongly inclined to the belief that the Professor's *comparison* must be very much larger than his *causality* to induce him thus to reason from *cause* to *effect*, if there could be no possible connection between the body of David and his ascension into heaven. If the apostles thus reasoned, they must have been strange logicians!

Acts xxiv. 14, 15. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust."

The Professor asks:—

"First, upon what authority does Paul affirm that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection, 'both of the just and the unjust?' Secondly, supposing the assertion to be well founded, how are his words to be construed in consistency with what we assume to be the true doctrine of the Scriptures on this subject?"

In answer to the first, he endeavors to show that the Pharisees *did not* all believe in the resurrection of the wicked; and yet he brings no *positive* testimony to that effect. He quotes Josephus as saying:—

"'They (the Pharisees) also believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again.' (J. A. L. 18. c. 1.) Again, 'They say that all souls are incorruptible; but that the soul of the good man only passes into another body, while that of the wicked is subject to eternal punishment.' (J. W. L. 2. c. 8.)"—p. 252.

There is, however, in the above, no such positive declaration that they believed the wicked would never be raised, as Professor Bush would demand for proof that the righteous will be. He then shows from various texts and other quotations, that *the* resurrection was considered as only the portion

of the righteous ; but we have shown, we trust, that the resurrection of the righteous is thus termed by way of distinction, to denote its priority and superiority to that of the wicked. But he admits that some of the Pharisees thus believed, and that "of this fact the apostle, in the passage before us, doubtless takes advantage." We, however, are fully satisfied with Paul's opportunities of knowing the opinions of the Pharisees,—having been himself one of the "straitest sect," brought up at the feet of Gamaliel ; and we have the fullest confidence in his veracity ; so that what he says respecting their faith, we have no hesitation in believing.

As to his second question, he concludes that,—

"There can be no doubt that he would conform his averments to those of Christ. These, we have already seen, when considered in the letter, announced, in some cases, the resurrection of the wicked as well as that of the righteous."—p. 255.

He then applies the same principles of explanation to the language of Paul, that he does to the language of the Savior. So that what we have remarked respecting that, is applicable to this also.

Before we leave this passage, we will quote an extract Professor Bush makes from Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew:—

"If you have met with certain persons, *called* Christians, who do not confess this, but have the boldness to blaspheme the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, *but that immediately on death the soul is received up into heaven*, do not consider them as Christians, any more than, properly speaking, you would give the name of Jews to the Sadducees, and other heretical sects. . . . I, however, and as many as are altogether orthodox, believe that there will be *a resurrection of the flesh*, and a millennium in Jerusalem restored, adorned, and enlarged, according to the predictions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets."—p. 253.

Professor Bush quotes the above to show that "in that early age there were some who came very near" entertaining the same views as he himself does. It, however, cannot be very flattering to him, that such should be called "heretics" and unworthy the name of "Christians," by the saints to whom the faith was once delivered ! He refers to it as "gleams of truth" appearing even in that early age ; but we find a "*gleam*" of the same faith at a still earlier age, when "Hymeneus and Philetus" taught "the resurrection is past already," which overthrew "the faith of some."

Nothing is more clear than that the Jews and early Christ-

ians believed that the saints do not enter heaven at death, but are waiting for the resurrection, for the consummation of their hopes. It is only a modern belief that locates the saints in heaven soon after death. And it is this very *error* that is the ground-work of the denial of the resurrection of the body. For if the soul at death enters the full enjoyment of the heavenly kingdom, all are ready to inquire the need of a resurrection?—why should the glorified saint leave the joys of heaven, to enter again the body laid aside at death? And such questions would be pertinent. But when it is seen that the crowns of the saints are deferred to the last day, that their inheritance is reserved in heaven ready to be revealed in the last time; then the resurrection is seen in all its glory, as an object of desire to every saint, living or dead.

Rom. viii. 10, 11. "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."

This he understands to refer "to the spiritual quickening of the body by the vitalizing influence of the Holy Ghost in the present life." His reasons are, 1. The Holy Spirit is here said to quicken; "but a literal resurrection of the dead, even supposing it taught at all, is not elsewhere attributed to the Spirit. 2. That "mortal" signifies "tending to death" but not dead, so that on this theory the apostle would say, "God shall raise to life your living dead bodies," and 3, "This interruption destroys the continuity of the apostle's discourse." —p. 257.

We can see no force in this last objection; for, to us, the doctrine of the resurrection is intimately connected with the subject of his discourse. As to the word "mortal," it is true that it denotes "tending to death;" but the apostle did not affirm they would be raised *while mortal*. The sense is evidently that these "mortal bodies" we now inhabit, after they are dead, will again be quickened by the Holy Spirit. His first objection is also equally invalid. For frequent mention is made of the resurrection by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Christ himself was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit," 1 Pet. iii. 18. In Rev. xi. 11, the "two witnesses" are raised by the Spirit of life from God entering into them. "Except a man be born of the Spirit," which we understand is complete only in the resurrection, "he cannot

enter the kingdom of God."—John iii. 5. And in Ezekiel xxxvii. 14, it is said the whole house of Israel are to be brought out of their graves, by God's putting his Spirit in them, that they may live.

Romans viii. 22, 23. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth, and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

Professor Bush contends that the word "*body*" in this text, denotes the "collective body of the saints;" and that otherwise the apostle would have said "the redemption of our *bodies*." And also that "this is to be the realized consummation of the Christian's hopes, that to which they are all to come as one redeemed, regenerated, sanctified *body*"—"their common inheritance." He says:—

"We believe, moreover, that the apostle in adopting the phraseology had his eye on the parallel expression in Isaiah xxvi. 19,—'Thy dead men shall live, together with my (i. e. our) dead body shall they rise.' But it does not follow that he intended by such a tacit reference, to suggest the true exposition of that text."—p. 259.

We see nothing in this to disprove its application to the resurrection of the body. Paul's use of the term "*body*" in the singular number, does not *prove* that he had reference to the "collective body of the saints." Even "ourselves, [each one of us] "which have the first fruits of the Spirit," "groan within ourselves," "waiting [individually] for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." But suppose it has reference to "the collective body of the saints," might it not as well apply to their *resurrection*, as to their *etherealization*? He admits this state is "identical" with "the manifestation of the sons of God"—their final state.

2 Cor. v. 2—4. "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not because we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."

Here his argument is, that "the house from heaven for which the apostle longed, is the same with the 'spiritual body' of which he speaks, 1 Cor. xv. 44." This we admit; and also that in "the very unanimous opinion of commentators" this "is the resurrection body." But he says "the apostle uses the *present* tense, *we have*" a building, &c., first verse;

"and not the future tense, *we shall have.*" And he adds :—

"Secondly, it is clear, we think, that Paul expected to be clothed upon with this heavenly house *as soon as he left the material body.*"—p. 260.

To this it may be replied that as Paul had not then left the body, this spiritual house was not then received ; so that upon the Professor's hypothesis it was still *future*. It might therefore not be received for eighteen hundred years ; and still, if it was *certain* then to be received, the apostle might say we *have* such a house. But how is it "clear" he expected to enter it at death ? Says Professor Bush :—

"This is evident from the whole strain of his discourse, but especially from verses 6, 8. 'Knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord : we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord.' What other inference can we draw from this, than that he expected at once to assume that celestial tenement which would capacitate him for being with Christ?"—p. 260.

He then claims, if he sleeps till the resurrection, it would not "be to be absent from the body. It would rather be to be *with* the body, if the soul is so united with its destiny that it sleeps with it in the grave, and only awakes when it awakes." And if Paul was to be "with his Savior in his disembodied spirit," he would not be "clothed upon."

It is however clear from the context that Paul is speaking of three distinct stages of being :

1. In this tabernacle ;
2. Absent from the body and present with the Lord ; and
3. Clothed with our house from heaven.

If Paul could not be present with the Lord until he had received his "*spiritual body*," he would not *then* be *absent* from the body." It is worthy of remark that when he speaks of being only "absent from the body," he merely says "We are confident and *willing* rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." But when he speaks of receiving his resurrection body, he exclaims :—"For in this we groan, *earnestly desiring* to be clothed with our house which is from heaven : if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked." Then he proceeds to say,—"*For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened : not because we would be unclothed, but clothed, that mortality might be swallowed up in life.*" It is therefore evident that while he looked forward to his resurrection with the most

earnest desire, he was even *willing* to be absent from the body a while and present with Christ. Or, as he says, Phil. i. 21—24,—“For me to live is Christ, and to die is *gain*. For I am in a straight, betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is *far better* ;” although to abide in the flesh was more needful for the church. Not so does he speak when he refers to his resurrection, as merely “*gain*,” or something “*far better* ;” but he speaks of it as “the *glorious liberty* of the children of God,” for which they *groaned and travailed in pain* waiting for it, with *earnest expectation*.—Rom. viii. 19—23.

But the Professor *has* one text to prove that the resurrection body is *another* body than that deposited in the tomb. Hear him :—

“As our Savior said, Mark xiv. 58, in speaking of his resurrection, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another *made without hands*,’ which must certainly refer to his spiritual body in contradistinction to his natural ; so also the ‘house from heaven *not made with hands*,’ for which the apostle longed, was to be immediately assumed.”—p. 261.

Here we unexpectedly do find *one* passage of Scripture which our author is willing to understand in its most *literal* import. And we rejoice that he pays so much deference to the inspired word as thus to receive a *single text*. Unfortunately, however, for the Professor, that which he has quoted as the language of our Savior, is only what the *false witnesses* testified he had said : Mark xiv. 56—59,—“For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together. And there arose certain, and bare *false witness* against him, saying, ‘We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands.’ *But neither so did their witness agree together.*” The language of Christ was, John ii. 19,—“Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up”—not *another* temple, as the false witnesses testified, but the one that is destroyed ; and lest any should suppose he referred to the Temple, it is recorded that “he spake of the temple of his body.”

We are sorry, when the Professor is so willing to rest on the *literal* averment of *any* text, to be obliged to take it from him. But he may still refer to it as a “gleam” of light in “that early age,” as evidence that the *ones* who did thus

speak, gave utterance to sentiments similar to his own view of the resurrection.

He further claims that "Moses and Elijah certainly had" bodies "when they appeared" with Christ "on the holy mount;" and that "the angel who appeared to John, Rev. xxii. 9, and declared himself one of his 'fellow-servants and of his brethren the prophets,' " was clothed in a resurrection body. "And if he, why not others?"

We reply that Elijah never died: so that his body was the same as would have been his resurrection body. And it is no more incredible that Moses, while unclothed, should have a visible personal appearance on the mount, so that the disciples were *miraculously* enabled to see him, than it is that the rich man in the world of spirits, when his body was buried and his five brethren were still living in the flesh, could see Abraham and Lazarus afar off.—Luke xvi. 19—31. And the angel that appeared to John might have been Enoch or Elijah, who were never "unclothed;" or he might have been like Moses on the mount; or he might have been one of the saints who arose at Christ's resurrection. So that these cases are no evidence of a resurrection at death.

2 Cor. v. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

This text he contends does not prove that all will appear before the judgment seat in the *bodies* in which they sinned; although they are to be judged for the sins done in the body.

We are not disposed to controvert the idea that the *body* need not necessarily appear before the judgment seat of Christ. For we are inclined to the opinion, that the judgment is after death and before the resurrection; and that before that event the acts of all men will be adjudicated: so that the resurrection of the righteous is their full acquittal and redemption—their sins being blotted out when the times of refreshing shall have come, Acts iii. 19; while the fact that the wicked are not raised, proves that they were previously condemned.

1 Thess. iv. 13—17. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with

a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in Christ shall rise first : Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air : and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

As an objection to the common view of Christ's bringing with him at his coming, the saints who have slept in him, he asks :—

"How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him? And how can they be with him, unless they shall first have risen for that purpose? And how can they have risen, without having undergone a resurrection? And how can they have been the subjects of this resurrection, if they are yet reposing in the dust? This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence that follows: 'The dead in Christ, (i. e., those that have slept in him,) shall rise first,' i. e., shall rise, or shall have arisen *previously*.'—p. 266.

He then argues that the saints are in heaven with, and will come from heaven in their resurrection bodies: so that when Paul says, some man will ask, 1 Cor. xv. 35, "How are the dead raised, and with what body do they *come*?" it is "not with what body do they *come up* out of the ground, but with what body do they *come down* from heaven?"!!

All the above interrogations are answered by the text, in 2 Cor. v. 8., where it is taught that when Paul should be absent from the body he would be present with the Lord. And if Paul in the *interim* between death and the resurrection is thus present with the Lord, why are not all the saints who sleep in Jesus? And if they are thus with Jesus, when he shall descend to raise their bodies, God will bring them with him. We admit the *usus loquendi* that "shall rise *first*," is "shall rise *previously*." But it must still be previous to something which follows; and that is evident, by the ascension of those who are alive and remain, together with the risen saints. "Then," he says, "we who remain" shall be caught up; but the dead in Christ must rise *previously*, or they could not ascend *together*, which Professor Bush says is "simply" "shall be caught up to *be with him*." We however might ask, if they at death enter upon their eternal reward, how can they be said to sleep? And if they sleep not, how can they wake from sleep? And if they now sleep, and it is their eternal state, will they not sleep forever? How can they ever be said to awake? But he adds:—

"How then, it may be asked, shall we avoid the conclusion drawn from the apostle's language in this passage, that the resurrection is to be simultaneous, and destined to occur at the second Advent? Our answer will be inferred from the previous tenor of our remarks. We have

already adverted to the *principle* which we regard as forming the key to this kind of diction, wherever it occurs. Christ and the apostles expressed themselves on this and kindred topics in language conformed to the formulas of speech to which they had been accustomed from the necessities of their Jewish birth and training.”—p. 269.

How far this may harmonize with another remark* we find on the same page, that, “We feel not at liberty to put the least constraint upon the out-speaking purport of any text,” we leave others to judge. It is sufficient for us that Professor Bush admits the apostle *supposed* he *was* teaching a literal resurrection, and that his hearers thus understood his meaning.

Phil. iii. 21. “Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.”

This he deems an “announcement of a similar condition, as the prospective lot of the whole multitude of the saints in the day of their final manifestation; an event not to transpire in the natural, but in the spiritual world;” where they have glorified bodies like “Moses and Elias;” and that the apostle has in view rather “the *translation* of the *living*, than the *resurrection* of the *dead* saints.”

The language of the apostle is, however, explicit, that he “will *change*,” not *ex-change* “our *vile body*, that *it*,” not another body, “may be *fashioned* like unto his glorious body.” And the explicit declaration of *Paul* that *our vile* body is to be thus *fashioned* anew, is certainly as demonstrative as the testimony of the “*false witness*” that Professor Bush adduced to prove it was *another* body.

2 Tim. ii. 16—19. “But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already: and overthrow the faith of some. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.”

This portion of Scripture is the last which he quotes in this connection. He says:—

“In the absence of any definite knowledge of what they really held on the subject—as to which all ecclesiastical testimony halts—it cannot be properly affirmed that the error charged upon their creed by the apostle is one that is chargeable, also, on the same grounds, upon *the view* we are now advocating. This makes the resurrection indeed to be *passing*, but not *past*. Men are not raised from the dead till they die, and they do not die till they live. It is only *past* when it has embraced the totality of its subjects.”—p. 273.

To say nothing of the small distinction in the *tense* of the two views respecting the resurrection, or of *dying* being considered a resurrection *from* death, we would suggest to the Professor that possibly Himeneus and Philetus merely expressed themselves in accordance with certain "diction" and "formulas of speech" then current, so that when they taught the resurrection was *past*, they only *meant* it was then *passing*. And if so, why are not they as good authority as those whom Justin Martyr called "heretics," to whom the Professor refers as having received some "gleams of light" in so early an age.

In view of all these passages, our author comes to the conclusion that "the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine sanctioned either by reason or revelation, as far as we have hitherto interrogated the testimony of each." But how logical such a conclusion is, our readers, from the evidence here presented, have an opportunity to judge. For ourselves, we have found nothing to weaken in the least, but have rather been strengthend in our previous conclusions. He has not as yet satisfactorily answered the inquiry of the apostle, "*Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead ?*"

"THE RESURRECTION VIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THE JUDGMENT."

Under this head he gives a long argument to show that,

"The moral power of the doctrine of 'a judgment to come,' does not truly rest so much upon the imagined form or concomitants of the process, upon its being held upon the *assembled* multitude of its subjects, at a particular time or place, or as marked by certain forensic solemnities, as upon its bearing upon individual character and destiny." "But we are still unable to resist the conclusion, that the essence of judgment is adjudication, and that this is independent of time, place, and circumstance."—p. 276.

He claims the character of each man is decided at death. He says:—

"Lazarus died, and was carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died, and in hell he lifted up his eyes in torment. This is a virtual judgment." "Consequently no subsequent judicial sentence can be conceived as reversing that which is in effect passed at the instant the soul leaves the body; nor can the object of such a general assize as is usually understood to be announced under the title of the 'general judgment,' be to enact *de novo* a process which has really been accomplished upon each individual of the race as he entered, in his turn, the world of retribution."—p. 277.

We have no hesitation in admitting that so far as the judgment has respect to the *adjudication* of the individuals of the human race, that the above conclusions are correct. The records of the "Book of Life" must be perfect when it is opened; and those only will be delivered at the first resurrection, whose names will "be *found* written in the book." The judgment at the coming of Christ we regard as the bestowal of the award, or the infliction of punishment, under the previous decision respecting the allotments of the human race, for which the departed wait till the resurrection morn. In Matt. xxv. 31—33, we read "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left."

This gathering can only have respect to the nations living at Christ's Advent. The wicked dead are not raised until a thousand years from this period, and there is nothing here said respecting a resurrection. The separation here spoken of must consequently have respect only to that which will take place between the righteous and the wicked, when the former shall be caught up to meet their Lord in the air at the Savior's "right hand," while the latter class will be left to be burned in the conflagration at the regeneration of the earth. But as the Professor's argument here has respect only to the adjudication of the human race, it can have no bearing upon this view of the judgment of the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom, when he will reward every man as his work shall be. It however leaves the same "*hiatus*" of two thousand years between the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew," p. 287, that the old view does; but as we have seen no proof that the twenty-fourth does *not* extend to the end of this period, it leaves no "*hiatus*" for which *we* feel particularly called to account.

Professor Bush claims that the Second coming of Christ was at the destruction of Jerusalem. His argument is:—

"Now we deem the evidence decisive that this economy of 'judgment' was to commence synchronically with that predicted 'coming' of Christ which is so splendidly set forth in the vision of Daniel," "where the Son of man receives his kingdom from the Ancient of days. But let it be borne in mind that this 'coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven,' announced by Daniel, is *precisely the same coming* with that announced by our Savior in the Gospels, especially Matt. xvi. 27, 28: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels;

and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here that shall not taste death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' So again, Matt. xxiv. 34, 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' So also, Matt. x. 23, 'Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come.' We hold it to be utterly impossible, upon fair canons of interpretation, to divorce these predictions of Daniel and of Christ from a joint reference to one and the same coming, and that, too, a coming that was to be realized in its incipient stages at the destruction of Jerusalem. We are satisfied, indeed, that that event did not exhaust the import of this pregnant prophecy. We doubt not that it embraces a grand series of events—a dispensation, in fine—extending through the lapse of hundreds of years, down to the period when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. But the commencement of this train of occurrences is to be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem."—pp. 285, 286.

In the foregoing it is claimed that the prophecies of Christ respecting his coming have respect to his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, that these prophecies synchronize with those of Daniel, and that as Christ refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, Daniel's must have referred to a "coming" at that time. But on page 288 he claims that the prophecies of Christ cannot refer to a future judgment because those of Daniel do not. This looks to us like "reasoning in a circle:"—Daniel cannot thus refer because Christ does not; and Christ cannot because Daniel does not. We will therefore first examine the prophecy of Daniel.

In the seventh of Daniel, to which reference is made, the prophet in a vision saw "four great beasts" rise out of the sea,—“the first like a lion,” “a second like a bear,” “another like a leopard” with “four heads” and “four wings,” and “a fourth beast dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly,” with “great iron teeth,” “and it had ten horns;” then “another little horn” arose, and plucked up “three of the first horns,” the saints of the Most High “were in its hand a time times and the dividing of time,” and it was to make war with them and prevail “against them until the Ancient of days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” Then “the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.—A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set and the books were opened.”

Then the fourth "beast was slain,"—the "dominion" of the three first having been previously "taken away,"—and his body given to the burning flame." And then there was given unto "one like unto the Son of man," "dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Such was the order of the events presented to the inspired Seer, in prophetic vision, by symbolical imagery. The "four beasts" were explained by the angel to denote "four kings," or kingdoms; and Professor Bush admits that they respectively symbolize the four universal monarchies of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. "The ten horns" of the "fourth beast," Professor Bush admits, are the ten divided kingdoms from the Roman empire; and of the "Little Horn" he says: "This Little Horn is unquestionably the ecclesiastical power of the Papacy." * The "time, times and the dividing of time," or one thousand two hundred and sixty days of its tyrannical power, he also admits are symbolic of one thousand two hundred and sixty years. He says, in writing to Mr. Miller, "In taking a *day* as the prophetic time for a *year*, I believe you are *sustained* by the *soundest exegesis*, as well as fortified by the high names of Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton,"† &c. And in writing to Professor Stuart, he says of this period: "I have in my own collection, writers on the prophecies, previous to the time of Mede, who interpret the one thousand two hundred and sixty days as so many years, and who are so far from broaching this as a *new* interpretation, that they do not pause to give the grounds of it, but proceed onward, as if no risk was run in taking for granted the soundness of the principle which came down to them accredited by the immemorial usage of their predecessors." ‡

Now if the order in which these successive symbols as presented in the vision to the prophet, is the order of the fulfilment of the successive events which they respectively symbolize, it must follow that the giving of the kingdom "under the whole heaven" to "One like unto the Son of man," will succeed the destruction of the Roman empire, in its decem-regal form as symbolized by "the ten horns." And,

* Hierophant, Vol. I. p. 109. † Ad. Her. Vol. VII., p. 38. ‡ Hiero. Vol. I., p. 246.

as far as they have been fulfilled, this order has been observed. Thus Babylon, symbolized by the first beast "like a lion," was succeeded by Medo-Persia, symbolized by the "bear." This in its turn was succeeded by Grecia, symbolized by the "leopard;" and when it had been divided towards the four winds, as symbolized by the "four heads" of that beast, it was in like manner succeeded by the Roman empire as symbolized by the "fourth beast." When this had continued its time, it assumed its divided form,—ten kingdoms arising within its territorial limits; among these came up the "horn" of Papacy, subverting three of the first kings, as symbolized by the "horns" of the beast, the "saints of the Most High" were in subjection to it for one thousand two hundred and sixty years, and it has warred against them even to the present day, and is now prevailing. Thus each individual particular, as shadowed forth in the vision, has been fulfilled in its *exact* order,—excepting what future events pertain to the judgment and the everlasting kingdom. And shall the order of these be an exception to the order of the fulfilment of all the preceding portions of the vision? Shall every other particular be fulfilled in the order of its symbolical representation, each succeeded by the other, and shall these be fulfilled during the fulfilment of the preceding symbols? The analogy in the fulfilment of the vision will certainly be observed in the fulfilment of these portions of it.

Again, the vision in all its symbolical representations has thus far been fulfilled *visibly* on the earth; and will the analogy in this particular be departed from, by an *invisible* fulfilment of these predictions? As all the events predicted in the vision are represented by symbols, are we not to expect there will be a relative proportion between the symbols and the things symbolized? Thus if a "lion" symbolized the Babylonian empire, a "bear" the Medo-Persian, and a "leopard" the Grecian, to make the symbols of the vision harmonize, must there not be the same relative proportion between the symbolical judgment and the majestic events symbolized by it, so that they will be as much greater than their symbols and as real, as those mighty empires were greater than the "beasts" by which they were symbolized? This must certainly be a correct position. Therefore JEHOVAH only could be symbolized by the "Ancient of days," and

Jesus Christ, by the "One like unto the Son of man;" and the scenes of the last judgment,—in the overthrow of human governments, the rewarding of every man as his work shall be, the conflagration in the purification and regeneration of the earth, and the giving of the kingdom under the whole heaven to Christ,—only could be symbolized by the closing scenes of the vision. If this view is correct, the coming of the "Ancient of days" can only be at "the end of the *age*," when all things that offend will be gathered out of the kingdom. And as the kingdom "*under the whole heaven*" is to be given to Christ, it can only succeed the demolition of all human governments, and be fulfilled in the personal and everlasting reign of Christ with his *saints* on the earth, as explained by the angel to Daniel, vii. 18, 27: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." "And the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

But we have one more argument to prove that the coming of the "Ancient of days," as symbolized in this vision, could not have been at the destruction of Jerusalem.—There is but *one* such coming presented in the vision. This is after the "Little Horn" has continued its time; for Daniel says, verse 21, 22, "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, *until* the Ancient of days came, *and* judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, *and* the time came that the saints *possessed* the kingdom."—Professor Bush admits that this "Little Horn" is Papacy, and that the one thousand two hundred and sixty days of its tyrannic rule are one thousand two hundred and sixty years.—Consequently the "Ancient of days" could not come until after the end of the one thousand two hundred and sixty years of Papal persecutions, and his coming must usher the saints into their everlasting kingdom.

Now as Professor Bush claims that this prophecy of Daniel, and Christ's predictions of his coming, must synchronize each with the other, it follows, as the judgment in Daniel can only synchronize with "the end of the *age*," that the like predictions in the New Testament must have respect to the same period. We will however briefly examine the *three*

texts upon which rests *all* the evidence of the "Second Advent" at the "destruction of Jerusalem."

1. Matt. xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." *

The point upon which this passage turns, is, whether "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," is his coming "in the glory of his Father with his angels" to "reward every man according to his works"? or is it a *miniature* representation of his coming and kingdom, which some standing there were to be permitted to see, so that in proclaiming his Advent they might be assured they were giving utterance to "no cunningly devised fable"? We incline to the last opinion. And the evangelist proceeds to record, that, "After six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him."—Matt. xvii. 1—3. Here, then, was a perfect miniature representation of his coming in his kingdom. And, following so immediately, and being recorded as if it were an explanation of the Savior's promise, we are unable to see how it can be understood otherwise than as its fulfilment.

That this is the true exposition of this passage is more clearly seen by a comparison of it with Luke's record of the same events. He has recorded it, vii. 27, 28: "But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God. *And it came to pass* about an eight days *after these sayings*, he took Peter, and John and James," &c., and was transfigured. Here we are expressly assured that this promise of their seeing the kingdom, *came to pass* about an eight days after. Peter, also, one who witnessed this glorious vision, testifies

* Bishop Horsley commenting on this text, says, "He says not who shall not die, but 'who shall not *taste* of death.' Not to *taste* of death, is not to feel the pains of it—not to taste its bitterness. In this sense was the same expression used by our Lord upon other occasions, as was, indeed, the more simple expression of dying. 'If a man keep my saying, he shall never *taste* of death.'" He then contends, that then, when the Son of man shall come in his kingdom, the wicked who were then standing there, will taste the second death, "in comparison with which the previous pangs of natural death are nothing."—*Sermons* p. 144.

that this scene was received as an evidence and demonstration of his second coming. He says: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory *when* there came such a voice from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven *we heard* when we were with him in the holy mount." 2 Peter i. 16—18.

2. Matt. xxiv. 34. "Verily I say unto you, this *generation* shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled."

This text upon Professor Bush's own explanation, proves nothing for his position; for he adopts Mr. Cunningham's translation of the Greek word, rendered fulfilled, who says its original signification is not "to be *completely fulfilled*," but "the strict rendering of the clause" is, "*shall be fulfilling*, or *shall begin to be*." If, therefore, the true rendering is that those predictions of our Savior would begin to be fulfilled during the generation then living, it would not follow that Christ's Second Advent must then occur. For his prediction of Jerusalem's overthrow was fulfilled within forty years; but the coming of Christ is one of the last events predicted in that discourse, and would not necessarily then transpire, unless *all* those events must then be "completely fulfilled." But Prof. Bush says the prophecy will not be then *exhausted*, but will extend through a lapse of hundreds of years. If it must be thus extended, the coming of Christ, one of the *last* events in that prediction, could only transpire at the end of that lapse of centuries. We, however, incline to the opinion previously expressed, that this *generation* to which Christ referred, was the last of which he was speaking which should witness the signs of his coming, which would not be seen till "*after* the tribulation of those days"—extending through the Pagan and Papal persecutions,—and which have all been seen by the present generation."*

3. Matt. x. 23. "Verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

* The sun was darkened May 19, 1780. The night following, the moon, although at full, did not give her light; and, Nov 13, 1833, the meteoric stars fell from heaven, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs when shaken by a mighty wind.—Rev. vi. 13.

What going over the cities of Israel, and what coming is here referred to? It will be seen by the context that our Savior was now sending forth his twelve disciples on their first mission. "And it came to pass when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence, to teach and to preach in their cities." So then the only fair construction which can be put upon this text, is, that it had respect to their going over the cities of Israel on that mission whither he himself would come before their mission would be completed; and we read, Luke 9: 10, that "The apostles when they were returned, told him all they had done," i. e. when they were returned from going over the cities of Israel, from preaching the word every where, whither they had been sent.

We thus find that the *three* passages which are supposed to prove the setting up of Christ's kingdom, at the destruction of Jerusalem, are no certain demonstration of such a fulfillment; while other portions of Scripture expressly contradict such an interpretation.

"THE FIRST RESURRECTION AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE DEAD."

Professor Bush claims that the judgment portrayed in Rev. 20, "is identical with that of Daniel, as related in his seventh chapter," which he exhibits in the following parallel between the two prophecies, taken from Mede.

DANIEL 7th.

V. 9. "I beheld till the thrones were pitched down (i. e. till the judges sat.)

22. "And judgment was given to the saints of the Most High.

And the saints possessed the kingdom (viz. with the Son of man, who came in the clouds, v. 13.)"

JOHN 20th.

V. "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them.

And judgment (i. e. authority to judge B,) was given unto them.

And the saints lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

We admit with the Professor that "the judgments here described" are "the same"; also that "the judgment of Daniel assuredly commences synchronically with the commencement of Christ's kingdom," and that "the judgment of John must be assigned to the same period." But as it has not been *proved* that the judgment of Daniel begins with, and "flows on," "during the Gospel age," it *does not follow* that "the

Millennium of John *must* be referred to a past, and not to a future period of history": the proof of which, Prof. B. says, "evidently depends upon the correctness of the interpretation we have given of the true sense of Daniel's oracle," p. 303.

Rev. xx. 4—6. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

The "thousand years," the Millennium here brought to view, Prof. Bush locates in the *past*. He does not give us the year of their commencement, or termination; or give us any clue by which we may satisfactorily arrive within a few centuries of either *terminus*. But as these "souls" that "lived" were "of them that were beheaded," he argues that

It "carries us back to a very early era of Christianity;" and as they "had not worshipped the beast," it "transports us to the past," "when the Roman beast" was "in the height of his power." And as some were designated "who did not 'worship' the image of the beast," it "conducts us to a period still later, when the *ecclesiastical* form of the Roman empire was established;" and as all "these several classes 'lived'" "within the limits of the specified thousand years," we are "thrown back for their commencing period to a very early epoch of the church." "For," he says, "we strenuously maintain that it is the same persons who live and reign, and judge, and are beheaded, and all too *at precisely the same time*." And "though they become the victims of Pagan and Papal persecution, and seal their testimony with their blood, yet their higher and truer life, their enemies cannot reach."—As our Savior says, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me *shall never die*."—pp. 305. 306.

We have thus given a synopsis of his argument for the location of this period in the past, "the precise *termini* of which," he says, "we are not competent, nor do we deem it necessary to fix with absolute precision." But, it will be remembered, he admits "the stress of the proof" of its correctness, "depends upon the correctness" of his "interpretation" of "Daniel's oracle." And as we have seen the incorrectness of that "interpretation," this position still *lacks* its proof. We see no evidence that this *living* and *beheading* are transpiring at the *same time*. He says,

"This period defines an era, marked on the one hand by the prevalence

of the power of the Roman beast, and the errors, apostacies, and persecutions of the Roman church; and on the other, by the spiritual quickening and spiritual reigning of the martyrs and confessors of the truth, whose faithful testimony was illustrated by the fires kindled around them by papal cruelty, and towering, as beacon lights in those dark ages, above the stakes to which they were tied. This state of things the prophet beholds in entranced vision. He saw their 'souls' living in the midst of the slaughter of their bodies, for it is only by exegetical violence that their 'beheading' can be separated from their 'reigning.' The true version is '*did not*,' instead of '*had not*;'—I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which *did not worship* the beast, neither his image, neither *did receive* his mark in their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.' That is, there was a succession of such faithful witnesses living, dying, rising, reigning, throughout that whole period."—p. 309.

He supposes the "quickening" is a "spiritual quickening," the same as in Dan. 12: 2,—“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” &c.; although he does “not question” that “a *corporeal* resurrection, in the limited sense before explained, may be alluded to in the words of the prophet”; and he quotes from Cressener that “both Grotius and Porphyry confess that the words are very wonderfully and artificially put together, to hint at the mystery of the resurrection—so wonderfully, indeed, as it is to be admired how they can be made to intend anything else”!

We have already seen that the 12th of Daniel brings to view most clearly a *literal* and *corporeal* resurrection; so that nothing is gained by claiming that this quickening is the same as that, which we admit. We can also see no particular force in the argument respecting the *tense* of this vision, even by adopting Prof. Bush's version. To say they "*had not*" worshipped the beast would imply a time previous to this "living"; but if it was merely "*did not*," it does not prove that it has no respect to a prior time; it is all in the *past* tense, and some of the references might have been to earlier and others to later points of time. Thus John saw them, they were beheaded, before,—not *being* beheaded; they did not worship the beast when they were under his power, neither his image, nor receive his mark *to save* their heads, so that at this first resurrection, as a reward for their previous faithfulness, they *lived* and reigned with Christ 1000 years. This slight variation of the *tense* need not affect the application of the text.

But says Professor Bush:—

On the supposition that the millennium of John is yet future and coincident with the seven thousand years from the creation, we hold it to be impossible to assign a satisfactory reason why the saints *then living* should be

characterized by attributes that pertain to the pious of another and entirely different period.”—p. 306.

We should admit the full force of this objection if it was made in respect to a spiritual or temporal millennium. And the question may well be asked, why the favored inhabitants of such an age of the world should be so highly blessed above all who have gone before them, and should be spoken of as martyrs, or as having the spirit of martyrs, when there is no martyrdom to suffer, no persecuting enemy, and no tempting adversary? But the view which we oppose to that of the Professor entirely does away with this objection. This view represents the martyrs who were beheaded, with all who have overcome the world in all ages, as being raised “*from the dead*,” as having attained unto the first resurrection, and as reigning on the regenerated earth under the personal reign of Christ. The language of the text is therefore perfectly applicable to this view, while the objection holds good against a *probationary* millennium in the future.

But another reason why he adopts his views of the Millennium, is, that he can find no evidence of any end of the world. He says :

“As to any such event as the *physical destruction* of the globe which we inhabit, or the *physical passing away* of the heavens, we are constrained to acknowledge that we have sought the evidence of it in vain throughout the oracles of inspiration. No language to this effect can possibly be more expressive than that which teaches the contrary. ‘Who laid the foundations of the earth, *that it should not be removed forever*.’ ‘One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; *but the earth abideth forever*.’ ‘And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven*, (consequently *upon the earth*), shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.’ Prophecy contains nothing that carries us beyond this.”—p. 308.

This objection, like the other, is a valid one against the common view of the end of the world, that the earth will cease to be. But this is not the Scriptural doctrine; and these texts prove that the earth *will* abide forever. How then, is it asked, can it be physically burned? It is upon the same principle that it was once destroyed by water: it none the less abideth forever. It was not annihilated: neither will it be by the conflagration in its *regeneration*. That, instead of being its *destruction*, we look upon as its *restoration*, as “the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets.” Prof. Bush admits that the “destruction” announced in 2 Pet. 3: 7—12, “whatever it be, is plainly *anterior* to the ushering in of the New Jerusalem state, or the New Heavens

and earth of Isa. 65: 17." But he denies that that is a *literal burning*.

But if this is not to be a literal conflagration, we must deny that the flood was a literal *deluge*. Peter says, "The world that then was being overflowed with water perished; but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." If one of these events is literal, both must be. But Peter is still more positive: he adds, "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also; and the works that are therein shall be burnt up." It would seem from the prediction that this earth had become so corrupted and defiled with sin, that it could be purified and made fit for an angelic residence only by a deluge of fire. And that no one may suppose this is the termination of its existence, he continues,—“Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” The earth then is restored to a condition wherein it may *abide forever*, where the “kingdom *under* the whole heaven” may be an everlasting kingdom, and where those who sleep in the dust of the earth, whose names are written in the book of life, when they shall awake *from* the dead, may reign with Christ to all eternity. In applying the judgment in question to the commencement of this period, all is harmonious. But he says:

“I saw the souls of them which were beheaded, &c. This is language appropriate to a *mental* and not an *ocular* perception, the objects of which were not *risen bodies* but *risen souls*.”—p. 312.

It will be seen by a reference to the text that the vision is progressive. There is first the binding of Satan, &c., then thrones, then the thrones are occupied by those to whom judgment is committed, and then he saw the *souls of them* that were beheaded. If these *souls* were then in their resurrection bodies, it would be the *souls* which were beheaded; but they were only *souls of them*. The next he saw was that they *lived*, &c. which is explained to be “The First Resurrection.” But says the Professor,

“John does not say that he saw that the men who were beheaded *lived again* on the earth. He asserts merely, that he saw the souls of them that were beheaded, not living *again*, but *living*.”—p. 311.

This is true; but when he speaks of the “rest of the dead,”

he says *they* lived not *again* till the 1000 years were finished ; which implies that these are living *again*.

He then claims, " the ' rest of the dead ' neither awake during the 1000 years, nor at any other time " ; that the Old Testament does not teach the resurrection of the wicked, and that the Jews believed in no such resurrection. It is however sufficient that the New Testament teaches there will be " a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust," and when the text asserts they will not live again till the end of the 1000 years, it may be that they *then will live* again. As the term living again is applied to the wicked,* it shows they have previously been alive. And though they will never participate " in that principle of divine life of which Christ is the sempiternal source," yet they will arise at the resurrection of condemnation.

With this view all the Scriptures harmonize. But Prof. Bush, in locating this period during the dark ages, must show that Satan was then bound so that he could not deceive the nations, during the very time he was practicing his most wicked arts and deceiving the greatest numbers. He also makes *saints* of all the subjects of the second resurrection, when none are pronounced blessed and holy, or exempt from the second death, but those that have part in the first resurrection, which implies that none others will be exempt or blessed. And he makes a succession of persons live and *die* during a period *through which those who were martyred should live*.

Rev. xx. 11—15. " And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away ; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God ; and the books were opened : and another book was opened, which is the book of life : and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it ; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them : and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire."

In the elucidation of the subject here presented, Prof. Bush has gone into a lengthy train of reasoning, mainly dependent

* Professor Bush says, " In the established text of the earlier editions of the Greek Testament," it is properly rendered " *lived not again*, and after this, our translation was made. But all modern editions unanimously reject this reading and adopt *lived not*."

To give this any weight, it must be shown that *modern* editions are more correct than the " *earlier editions* of the Greek."

upon his preceding conclusions, but which bear with more force upon the common application of the end of the world, than on the views we advocate. The principles upon which this part of his argument rests have been so fully presented, and this review has been extended to so great a length, that we can here give but a mere synopsis of his general reasoning. He locates this scene at "the sounding of the seventh Trumpet," when "the time of the *dead* is come *that they should be judged*"; who, he claims, "are the *spiritually dead*." He claims that this transpires "within the veil," that there is here no restoration of the wicked to their "*bodies*," and though "the judgment is here presented as concentrated to a point, to a single act," yet that "the *truth*, divested of all drapery, undoubtedly is, that each individual of this countless multitude *was actually* judged," when "he became a denizen of the world unseen." He claims that here mankind become endowed with "an increased power and intensity of spiritual vision," so that the "mental eye" can pierce "through and beyond all envelopes," so that the "scenes of the interior world shall be astonishingly disclosed to the realizing perception of the spirit"; that "this will be a *virtual* abolishing the old heavens and the old earth, and the opening of a new world to the wondering gaze of the illuminated spirit"—"the material universe" being as it were "*seen through*"—"opening heaven and hell to the spiritual perception of living men." This view he elucidates with much minuteness; but it will be seen that it depends for its truth upon the correctness of his previous expositions; and as it is more an endeavor to harmonize this portion of Scripture with his theory, than to obtain from it an independent argument in its support, we shall content ourselves with presenting this synopsis of it, and pass to that which may have a more particular bearing upon the question at issue. But, is the inquiry made, how are these conclusions to be refuted? Says Professor Bush:—

"The only possible basis on which a refutation of our position can be made to stand, is the denial of the *identity* of the state described in the closing chapters of Isaiah and John; and if this *identity of state* is denied, then the *identity of language* employed in describing each, must be accounted for, and the *principle* clearly laid down which requires us to admit this diversity of application."—p. 334.

The above, it will be seen, has reference only to those who still adhere to the common view of the end of the world,—that after the judgment, men have nothing more to do with

this earth, and that the New Jerusalem state precedes the advent. Those who adhere to that position, must refute it in the manner described by Professor Bush, or they must adopt Prof. Bush's views of the resurrection, as will be seen by the following extract:—"The New Jerusalem

Supervenes immediately or speedily, upon the overthrow of the mystical Babylon, another term for the False Prophet, whose destruction synchronizes with that of the beast, the symbolical designation of the fourth or Roman empire. The passing away of the Roman empire in its decem-regal form, is the result of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, and the seventh trumpet announces the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ; and this, according to Daniel, is the kingdom of the saints which endures for ever and ever, and consequently this must be the same as the New Jerusalem, unless there are to be two kingdoms both universal, or two eternities in succession. Now to what coming state of Christ's kingdom, do Isaiah's glowing description apply but to that set forth in Daniel, which is the same with the New Jerusalem of John? We confess to the intensest anxiety to know by what process of interpretation this result is to be set aside. If it stands, then must stand our collocation of the 'judgment of the dead,' for this takes place at the time of the passing away of the old heavens and the old earth, and it is the introduction of the new heavens and the new earth, which constitutes the New Jerusalem; and the announcement of this is the closing theme of revelation. We have no account of a judgment or anything else subsequent to it."—p. 334.

This last argument we regard as most clear and lucid, and it presents in a concise and forcible manner the scriptural and chronological relation of these prophecies to each other. It proves conclusively that if there is to be any resurrection of the body, any coming of the Lord, any burning of the world, any new heavens or earth, or any final judgment, they must all transpire at about this time: which Prof. Bush admits. Consequently with the common view of the *spiritual* reign of Christ, as it is a period subsequent to the first resurrection and conflagration, the judgment resurrection, &c. must also be *spiritual*. For if there is a literal resurrection, there cannot be afterwards a spiritual reign. And that this reign of Christ, whatever it may be, is subsequent to the period called "the end of the world," the last quotation from Prof. Bush fully proves. We do not wonder, then, that in writing in reference to the common view of a *spiritual* reign of Christ, Prof. Bush should feel that his conclusions were irrefutable. Indeed, it would be the only conclusion to which we could arrive that would even *seem* to harmonize these relative events.

We, however, in contending for a *literal* fulfilment of *all* these events, arrive at a result equally harmonious, and which has the advantage of the spiritual view, in that we are sus-

tained by the *literal* reading of all the various passages of scripture here examined ; and they can only be forced into a support of the spiritualizing *phobia*, by giving to them "*great elasticity of import.*" If the personal advent, the resurrection of the body, the cutting off of the wicked from the earth, and the purification and regeneration of the earth are all at the end of the fourth kingdom and the introduction of the New Jerusalem dispensation, as we contend, it follows that the reign of Christ and his saints will be on the earth, in an everlasting kingdom under the whole heaven. This was the faith of the church in its purest and best ages ; and Prof. Bush admits that the apostles, in writing the inditings of the Spirit, clothed the truths communicated through them in language in accordance with the literal view, on account of their own belief in the literal fulfilment of those events. While therefore we are pained and astonished that any should relinquish the literal view, we are fully satisfied that all who continue to adhere to the *spiritual reign*, if they will harmonize these relative events, will be driven to adopt Prof. Bush's view of the resurrection, judgment, &c. If after such an attempt to harmonize those events, any shall still adhere to the view of a *spiritual* coming of Christ, they must contend with Prof. Bush that "the Scriptural evidence of the resurrection of the body" is "*evaporated in the crucible of logical and philological induction.*" The Professor however did not to inform us how this *evidence* could be *evaporated*, unless there *was* evidence in the Scriptures to evaporate. We however find no necessity for evaporating, adumbrating, or rendering elastic, any portion of God's word. For, in receiving it in its obvious and grammatical import, all the various portions of the Scriptures harmonize with each other, like goodly stones in some fair and well proportioned building.

Professor Bush contends that—

"The New Jerusalem state which ensues is obviously a state developed on the earth, and among men in the flesh. This is evident from its being said that the leaves of the Tree of Life are for the healing of the Gentiles, and the kings of the earth are to bring their glory or riches into this holy city."—p. 333.

We admit that this will be on the *earth* and among men in the *flesh*; in the sense that Job used the term, Job xix. 26, when he gave utterance to his expectation that after the worms should have destroyed his body he should see God in the flesh, i. e. when he should rise from the dead. We know not

just what is implied by the healing of the *nations*—it does not read *Gentiles*.—But when the nations of the dead shall awake, they may receive an immortalizing healthful influence from the leaves of the Tree of Life—not a *restoration* from sickness,—but a preservation therefrom,—which will enable those who partake thereof to live for ever. For this reason Adam was driven from Eden,—“lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the TREE OF LIFE, and eat, and *live for ever*” —Gen. iii. 22. The “nations” referred to, are in the same connection affirmed to be “the nations of them which *are saved*,” Rev. xxi. 24—not Gentiles who are *not* saved, but the redeemed who will sing, Thou “hast made us unto our God **KINGS** and priests, and we shall reign on the earth”—Rev. v. 10. Then the “riches,” which they will bring into the Holy City, must necessarily be the treasures they had laid up in heaven, the rewards and emoluments pertaining to that state. The above specifications cannot therefore militate against the millenarian view.

Another consideration we find adduced in support of the Professor's view, is, that, according to it,

The saints will “pass at once from their corruptible to their incorruptible existence, and appear in his presence clad in his likeness. No centurial sleep of the soul—no imperfect state of disembodied consciousness—no semi-celestialized condition—awaits the heirs of ‘the resurrection and the life.’ The deposition of their garments of flesh is but the signal for their enrobement with the vesture of light, in which they shall shine forth as the brightness of the sun in the firmament of heaven.”—p. 347.

The above is evidence of a *beautiful theory*. But what saith the Scriptures in support of such a theory? Had he incorporated with it the salvation of all men, it might have been regarded as still more beautiful. But is it Scriptural? is a more important question. A beautiful theory will avail nothing, unless it is the truth; and being convinced that the Bible teaches a *different* doctrine, we feel constrained to abide still by its teachings, however beautiful that may be which does not harmonize with it. With the view we advocate, we have a theory which not only has the advantage of being Scriptural, but to us it is far more beautiful than the one just contemplated. What can be more lovely than Eden? And what more beautiful than the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets?

"THE TIMES OF THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS."

Acts iii. 19—21. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive, until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

In attempting an "exegesis" of this passage to bring "it in the attitude of alliance" with his "conclusions," Professor Bush first gives us a criticism on the phrase 'the times of refreshing,' the result of which is that—

"On the whole, we collect from these authorities the leading idea of cooling from the agitation of the air and that consequent refreshment and invigoration which is the result of a freer and fuller respiration, to one who is well nigh exhausted by oppressive heat or fatigue. It implies a kind of *return to the body of its animating principle*, and an effect which we should express in English by the word *inspiring*, as the relation of the original word to *soul* is very obvious."—p. 351.

It thus seems that after all criticism is exhausted on this phrase, it is still admitted to denote *more* than is expressed in our translation, even the "*inspiring*," the "*return to the body of its animating principle*," so that it is *re-souled*, as he renders a kindred expression in another scripture. And he says in reference to the various uses of this and kindred terms, that "In all these cases the predominant sense of what may be termed *freshened animation* is obvious." But while he admits "this idea is closely related to that of *resurrection*," he endeavors to avoid what we regard as the necessary and legitimate conclusion, by considering it only in the "sense of *moral or spiritual revivification*."

He next remarks that the phrase, "*when the times of refreshing shall come*," &c. should read, "in order that they may come"; so that "the purport of the apostolic injunction is, that they should repent *in order that* the times of refreshing might come." He then shows from Lightfoot that it would be an absurd view of the text if it means—

"Repent ye now, that your sins may be blotted out two thousand, or I know not how many hundred years hence, when the calling of the Jews shall come." And he adds, "If this be not the sense that they make of this text, that produce it to assert Christ's personal reign on earth for a thousand years,—I know not why they should then produce it; and if this be the sense, I must confess I see no sense in it."

This sense, "that our sins may be blotted out *at* the time of

refreshing," can be no more absurd than the view, "that our sins may be blotted out so that those times may come." For if such times are to come, they will come whether the sins of individual men are blotted out or not: although without their being blotted out, none could participate in the refreshing. But such is not the sense we attach to this text. We understand it as implying, not that our sins will be blotted out *when* it shall come, but that our sins may *be blotted out* when it shall come; i. e. that when the times of refreshing shall come, it may find our sins all blotted out, so that we may then become partakers of Christ's glory. But this text speaks of the times of refreshing as being, when Peter spoke, in the *future*; while Professor Bush's view makes it represent "a state of things *which had already come*." He, however, endeavors to obviate this difficulty by the consideration, that—

"We are expressly taught to pray that the 'kingdom of God *may come*,' although that kingdom was long ago established, and has been in fact *coming*, from age to age, ever since the ascension. In uttering this prayer, we merely express the desire that the kingdom *may continue to come*."—p. 355.

This example however can be of no authority in the present case, for we admit that if one of these passages is thus to be understood, both are. But we claim that both are to be understood solely in reference to the future, and the *second* advent. We find several attempts, in the work before us, to establish a "*usus loquendi*" in favor of the *spiritual* view, by a reference to a similar use of language in various places, while we contend that all the examples thus referred to have reference only to the literal interpretation. A *disputed* interpretation of one text can never *settle* the interpretation of another text. Neither can the disputed interpretations of two or more passages respectively settle the interpretation of each other, which is the principle too often made use of in the volume under review. As our Savior expressly commands us to pray "thy kingdom come," we regard it as a strong proof that it is *still future*; so that a reference to the use of the words there, is evidence to us that the present text refers to the *future*. Again he adds:—

"'And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you: ' that is,—' And the promise of sending Jesus Christ shall be fulfilled.' It does not, *any more than the former phrase*, imply the *futurition* of the sending relatively to the time when Peter uttered the words, but in reference to the time when the promise was given."—p. 356.

We admit that it is not future "*any more than* the former

phrase," and he might continue thus to rear his superstructure; but how durable would it be without a *sure* foundation? The greater the superstructure the greater would be the danger when it should fall. The key-stone of an arch will be of no service when the base shall give way. We must therefore continue to understand "shall send," "shall come," "thy kingdom come," &c. as having respect to the future only.

"*Whom the heaven must receive,*" &c. This "may be rendered," says Professor Bush, "either, 'whom the heaven must receive' or 'who must receive the heaven.'" But he prefers the latter, in the sense of occupying the heavens; but he says, "the drift of the announcement is substantially the same on either construction."

"*Until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began.*" Professor Bush regards "*until the times,*" in "the sense of *during*, implying not the *terminus*, but the *continuance* of the period in question," i. e., "during the restitution of all things." He adduces, in support of this rendering, various passages, as, "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together *until now*; i. e., during the whole past interval till now," &c. &c. But if this interpretation is admitted, it will only prove that the heavens will receive Christ until the restitution is accomplished. But says Professor Bush:—

"There is no necessary implication that he will *even then*, in any sense, vacate it, or return to the earth in any different *manner* from that in which he had continued to visit it during the whole period of his heavenly session."—p. 359.

The fact that a certain period is allotted for the heavens to receive him, seems to imply that when that period shall have been fulfilled, they would then no longer receive him; but the question we regard as settled by the promise to "send Jesus Christ." The expression is admitted to be in the future tense; and if it is not to be fulfilled in the future, we can see no *sense* in the allusion to the heavens receiving Christ. It seems to us as though the whole expression was so worded, to avoid the construction which the Hymenuses and Philetuses of that day might put upon it to bring it in alliance with their views, that the resurrection was *past* already; and which we think might be rendered "*passing*," IF "*thy kingdom come*" can be rendered "*coming*." Thus

when Peter spoke of "the times of refreshing" which should come, and of the sending of Jesus Christ, had he not been so explicit, the question would very naturally have arisen, whether Peter did not refer to some event already past, then *passing*, or as immediately to transpire. But when told that "the heavens must receive him until the times of restitution," it would avoid all such and kindred questions. Unless such was Peter's design, we can see no reason for such an allusion. And if Christ is then to come, we can see no propriety in the allusion, if his coming is to be only "his spiritual and providential presence," the same, though in a greater degree, as he has been ever present.

But what is the import of "*Restitution*"? Says Professor Bush:—

"The original term" is derived from a word "of which the primitive sense is to *restore*, as for instance a sprained or dislocated limb to its former soundness, a diseased body to health, a captive people to their own country, a distracted or lawless community to order and good government. Hence the noun is defined by philologists by *emendatio*, *restitutio in pristinum statum*, *mutationem in meliorem conditionem*; all importing *restitution* or *restoration* to a better state and condition. With this is obviously closely related the idea of *consummation*, *completion*, *perfection*."—p. 361.

There appears to be nothing in the above at variance with the doctrine of the restitution of the earth to its Eden state. As Professor Stuart defines it, the phrase is still more explicit. He says its "simple and literal meaning" "is *restoration*, i. e., the putting of any thing which has been injured, has decayed, or is worn out, into a renewed and good condition."—*Hints*, p. 168.

Professor Bush contends that this restitution is progressive during "the spiritual reign of Christ"; and he selects several Jewish testimonies * illustrative of their belief of the Restitution "under the reign of the Messiah." Viz.:—

"Man shall be restored in that time, namely in the days of the Messiah, to that state in which he was before the first man sinned." *R. Moses Nachmanides in Deut.* § 45.

"R. Berakyah, in the name of R. Samuel, said: Although things were created perfect, yet when the first man sinned, they were corrupted, and will not again return to their congruous state till Pherez (i. e. the Messiah) comes." "There are six things which shall be restored to their primitive state, viz., the splendor of man, his life, the height of his stature, the

* "As for my opinion," saith R. Menasse, "I think that after six thousand years, the world shall be destroyed, upon one certain day, or in one hour; that the arches of heaven shall make a stand, as immovable; that there will be no more generation or corruption; and all things by the resurrection shall be renovated, and return to a

fruits of the earth, the fruits of the trees, and the luminaries (the sun, moon, and stars.)"—*Bereshith Rabba*, Fol. 11, Col. 3.

"In that time, (i. e. of the Messiah) the whole work of creation shall be changed for the better, and shall return into its perfect and pure state, as it was in the time of the first man, before he had sinned."—*R. Beccai*, in *Shilcan Orba*, Fol. 9, Col. 4.—p. 360.

The above quotations are expressive of what we expect in the *restitution*, i. e., that it will be the restoring again of that which is greatly marred or injured, to its original condition,—that this earth with all the redeemed will be restored to their *Eden state*. And this we expect will be "under the reign of the Messiah," as the ancient people of God believed,—that *reign* not being yet commenced: Christ being still in the performance of his priestly office.

This restoration we expect at the *commencement* of the millennium, with the return of Christ in person to this earth to reign: the Church defers his personal advent to the *close* of the millennium. Says Professor Bush:—

"Of these two views, the *former undoubtedly involves the more correct interpretation of the term*, which denotes the act or process of restitution, but it is, in our view, utterly erroneous in regard to the time to which this process is to be assigned."—p. 362.

Professor Bush places its *time** as beginning at the reception of the Lord in heaven, and "to be going on on earth,"

better condition." Menasse also assures us that "this out of doubt, is the opinion of the most learned Aben Ezra," who looked for it in the New Earth of Isaiah lxx. 17.

The following Jewish Testimonies are from Brook's Elements of Pro. Intr. Literature, Vol. 3, pp. 33, 34.

"RABBI ELIEZER the great, is supposed to have lived just after the second temple was built. He, referring to Hosea's prophecy (chap. xiv. 8,) applies it to the pious Jews who seemed likely to die without seeing the glory of Israel, saying: 'As I live, saith Jehovah, I will raise you up, in the time to come, in the resurrection of the dead; and I will gather you with all Israel.'"

The Sadducees are reported to have asked Rabbi Gamaliel, the preceptor of Paul, whence he would prove that God would raise the dead. Nor could he silence them till he brought against them Deut. xi. 21, "Which land the Lord sware that he would give to your fathers." The Rabbi argued, that as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had it not, and God cannot lie, therefore they must be raised from the dead to inherit it.

RABBI SIMAI, though of later date, argues the same from Ex. vi. 4, insisting that the law asserts in this place the resurrection from the dead—to wit, when it is said: "And also I have established my covenant with them, to give them Canaan, &c.; for (he adds) it is not said to you but to them."

"Besides the foregoing statements," "there are likewise various traditions of the early Jewish church, which are entitled to attention from the general respect shown to them in all ages: though they cannot be urged in the light of direct testimony. Among these is the commonly received opinion, that the world was to last in its present state, during six thousand years; and that in the seventh millenary it was to be renewed, and all the promises of God made to the fathers, accomplished at that time."

* While Professor Bush places the time of the millennium, and the commencement of the restitution and resurrection, &c. in the past, he admits that "we have

to "the complete subjugation of every opposing power, and the universal and heartfelt acknowledgment of his supremacy as King of kings and Lord of lords."

We also believe that it will result as above expressed, but we believe it *will be* a "complete subjugation of every opposing power." And when that is accomplished there will be no *sin* on the earth; for if there were, every opposing power would not be *completely* subjugated. And if there shall be no more sin, there will be no more death, for death is the *consequence* of *sin*; and if there is no *death* or *sin*, man must have approximated far towards his primitive condition.

But this is to be "the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets." To get then a full understanding of the import of this term we need to have recourse to the sublime predictions of the inspired Seers, "who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." It seems from Peter's testimony, that the prophets of old not only gave utterance to the teachings of the Spirit, but they actually *spoke* or *wrote* as they were thus moved; i. e. they did not choose their language in which the teachings of the Spirit

arrived at a momentous era of the world," and that "if we take the ground of right reason, we must believe that the present age is one expressly foretold in prophecy, and that it is *just opening upon the crowning consummation of all prophetic declarations.*" He admits that we are now approaching the fulfillment of all those predictions which speak of the end of the world; and that the destruction of the fourth beast of Daniel, and of Paul's Man of sin, the conflagration of Peter, and the seventh trumpet of John, &c., are about to be consummated. He only denies the manner of their fulfillment.

In the time of this fulfillment there is no dispute between us. In writing to Mr. Miller he says: "I do not conceive your errors on the subject of chronology to be at all of a serious nature, or in fact to be *very wide of the truth.* In taking a *day* as the prophetic time for a *year*, I believe you are *sustained by the soundest exegesis*, as well as *fortified* by the high names of Mede, Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, Faber, Scott, Keith, and a host of others who have long since come to *substantially your conclusions* on this head. They all agree that the leading periods mentioned by Daniel and John *do actually expire about this age of the world*, and it would be strange logic that would convict you of heresy for holding in effect the same views which stand forth so prominently in the notices of these eminent divines." "Your results, in this field of inquiry, do not strike me as so *far out of the way* as to affect any of the great interests of truth or duty."—*Ad. Her.* Vol. 7. p. 38.

In writing to Professor Stuart, he says:—"I am not inclined precipitately to discard an opinion *long prevalent in the church*, which has commended itself to those whose judgments are entitled to profound respect. That such is the case in regard to the *year-day* calculations of prophecy, I am *abundantly satisfied*, and I confess, too, at once to the pleasure that it affords me to find that that which is sustained by *age* is also sustained by *argument.*" Again he says:—"Mede is very far from being the first who adopted this solution of the symbolic term day. It is the solution naturally arising from the construction put in *all ages* upon the oracle of Daniel, respecting the SEVENTY WEEKS, which by Jews and Christians have been interpreted weeks of years, on the principle of a day standing for a year. This fact is obvious from the Rabbinical writers *en masse*, where they touch upon the subject, and Eusebius tells us (Dem. Evangl. viii. p. 258.—Ed. Steph.) that this interpretation in his day was *generally*, if not *universally admitted.*" "It is plain that this canon of interpretation is no modern novelty."—*Hierophant*, Vol. 1. p. 243.

were clothed, but spake the words the Holy Ghost dictated. And if we pay any deference to the *words* spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets,—and we can get no clue to their communications only by their words—we must certainly admit that they have spoken of the "restitution" of "the wilderness," that it shall "be as *Eden*;" and of "the desert," that it shall be as "the garden of the Lord;" of the earth, that it shall be created anew; of man, that those written in the book shall be awakened from the dust of the earth; and of Messiah, that his dominion shall be under the whole heaven, and have no end.

"CHRIST'S 'DELIVERING UP THE KINGDOM.'"

1 Cor. xv. 24—28. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

Upon this passage of Scripture has been based the belief that Christ's kingdom was set up at his first advent, that it is merely a mediatorial kingdom—(as though the office of a king was to mediate between two opposing parties!)—and that at his personal coming it will be relinquished. But this is the only passage that the most remotely favors such a doctrine, and a close examination shows that even this lends no support to such a tenet. With many of the Professor's remarks under this head we are much pleased.

'*Then cometh the end.*' The true import of this, as Professor Bush shows, is "to perfect, to finish," and it "is much more nearly allied to perfection or consummation than to termination." He adds:—

"A river that sinks away in the sands and suddenly disappears, comes to an 'end.' But a river that merges itself in the waters of the ocean, comes to an 'end' in a very different sense. Yet this last is much nearer the Scriptural import of the word than the former. The chain of inspired revelation conducts us to a grand consummation in the universal establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth in the New Jerusalem economy, and there leaves us. It gives us no intimation of anything like a *physical winding up* of the present mundane system." The phrase, "'end of the world,' conveys indeed the idea of a *close*, but it is the close of a *dispensation*."—p. 368.

The above is expressive of our views on this point. We look for no physical winding up of this mundane system. We look for its *regeneration*, its *restitution*, at the commencement of Messiah's reign,—at the end of this *age* or dispensation and the commencement of an endless kingdom on the *earth*, the subjects of which will be only those "who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that *age*, and the resurrection *from the dead*": who can never "die any more; for they are equal to the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."—Luke xx. 34—36. Then will be the "*river*" of probation merged into the "*ocean*" of reward.

"*When he shall have delivered up the kingdom.*" Professor Bush correctly remarks that, "Upon the true construction of this clause hinges the genuine purport of the whole passage." He then gives the prevailing views of Christendom in respect to this, viz. that "the government which Christ as a man administers in heaven, will continue only while the present constitution of the world lasts," that then he "will lay down his former charge and give it over to the Father," &c. Professor Bush assumes that the "nominative" of "shall have delivered," is not Christ, nor is the kingdom spoken of Christ's kingdom, at least prior to its being delivered up." He then adduces the following evidence of "the perpetuity of Christ's dominion."

2 Sam. vii. 16. "'Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.' This, though originally spoken to David, is obviously to be fulfilled in Christ, as we learn from Luke i. 32, 33, 'He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.'

Is. ix. 6, 7. 'Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice, *from henceforth even for ever.*'

Dan. ii. 44. 'And in the days of those kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, *which shall never be destroyed*: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces, and consume all these kingdoms, *and it shall stand for ever.*'

Dan. vii. 14. 'There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: *his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*'

Heb. i. 8. 'To the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.'

Rev. i. 5, 6. 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' The invocation of perpetual dominion undoubtedly implies the promise of it.

Rev. xi. 15. 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.'

Rev. v. 13. 'Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.' This passage receives a great accession of weight in its present relation when viewed in connexion with the closing chapters of the book, where we learn that after the judgment by him who sat upon the great white throne, —when death and hell had delivered up the dead that were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works, and death and hell, and whoever was not found written in the book of life, were cast into the lake of fire,—after the formation of a new heavens and new earth, and the descent of the New Jerusalem,—after all this we find the 'throne of the Lamb' still subsisting, and the river of the water of life proceeding out from under it. But we have already seen that this must inevitably be long subsequent to the time of the delivering up of the 'kingdom' of which Paul here speaks.

Heb. vii. 21. 'The Lord sware and will not repent, *Thou art a priest for ever*—after the order of Melchisedec.' But Christ's kingship undoubtedly runs parallel with his priesthood. The perpetuity of the one, supposes that of the other. He is to 'sit a priest upon his throne;' i. e. combining the sacerdotal and legal dignity, and that for ever.

Heb. i. 2, 'Whom he hath appointed *heir of all things*.' The evidence from this is *inferential*, but still *conclusive*. Heirship denotes perpetuity. An estate received by inheritance does not revert back to the original possessor. Christ has received by inheritance, as the Father's eldest and only Son, 'the first-born of every creature,' 'the excellency of dignity and the excellency of power,' and of this inherited pre-eminence he can never be conceived as voluntarily divesting himself, much less as being deprived of it against his will. Wherefore, as *heir* of the kingdom, he holds his prerogative in everlasting fee."—pp. 370—372.

The above argument and citations, to our mind, prove conclusively the ever-enduring sovereignty of Christ, and the eternity of his kingdom. The question then is, What is his kingdom, which is thus eternal? Professor Bush affirms that "The kingdom of the Messiah is the *mediatorial kingdom*, and that of that *alone* is the apostle here speaking." But an objection to that is that his mediatorial office is no where in the Scriptures called a *kingdom*, and much less is it, *the kingdom*. The phrase, "*mediatorial kingdom*," is an absurdity of itself. For, a kingdom is under the government of its king; the exercise of the mediatorial office is not the exercise of kingly power, but it is mediating between two opposing parties, it is interceding for a party at the court of a superior. Such is Christ as an Advocate interceding for us with the Father: as our great High Priest, who is passed into the heav-

ens, making continual intercession for us ; but how does it become the office of a king to make intercessions for others ?

Again we hear it called "the Gospel kingdom," but it is not thus written in the Scriptures. It there reads, "The Gospel of the kingdom"—the Gospel being "the glad tidings of the kingdom." But, again, it can have no reference to Christ's mediatorial office, for that commenced with his ascension to heaven ; but according to Dan. vii. 14, cited above, this kingdom is not to be given to Christ until the "Ancient of days" shall come, and that is not until the "Little Horn," which Professor Bush admits is Papacy, has continued its appointed time, which he also admits is 1260 years ; for we read in the 21st and 22d verses of that chapter, that this "Horn" will war with the saints and prevail against them, until the coming of the Ancient of days, when the saints will possess the kingdom. And as the same Horn is still warring against the saints, it follows that the Ancient of days is not yet come, nor the kingdom given to Christ and the saints, as heirs and joint-heirs. But as he has been already invested in his mediatorial office for eighteen hundred years, that cannot be the same with his kingdom which is yet future. This kingdom is also to be given to Christ, according to Rev. xi. 15, cited above, which is at the ushering in of the New Jerusalem state, the time the kingdom in the text is to be delivered up.

But what are we to understand by the "delivering up of the kingdom" ? Says Professor Bush :—

"In the solution of the problem involved in the language, we adopt as a criterion the general scope of inspired prophecy as to the destinies of the kingdom of Christ. This is to be gathered mainly from the predictions of Daniel and the Apocalypse. From the combined testimony of these oracles we learn that there is to be a succession of worldly empires, exercising from age to age a despotic and tyrannous rule over the great mass of mankind ; till at length, under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the spiritual and eternal kingdom supersedes all these monarchies, and assumes to itself that dominion which they have so disastrously wielded over the subject nations of the earth."—p. 374.

He then affirms that the process of this transfer of power is "*gradual*," and has been "going on during the whole period of the prevalence of Christianity," to be "consummated" when this "epoch" "arrives." But while we agree in the time of its *consummation*, we entirely dissent from the view of its *gradual* fulfilment. No such gradual process is any where asserted in the Scriptures, while all the symbolical representations of this transfer of power are denoted by "the dashing to pieces of the image by the smiting of a stone cut

from the mountain without hands,* the 'grinding of it to dust so that it is blown away by the wind and no place found for it,' the slaying of the beast and the giving of its body to the burning flame,† 'the breaking of the exceeding great horn

* Professor Bush, in his notes on "Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the Great Image," assumes that "the smiting stone *gradually* abolishes all antagonist dominions, and *gradually* fills the earth."—p. 14. He says the stone, "by a secret and unseen power, is borne against the huge metallic fabric, and that not in a single stroke, but in a prolonged collision, till at length the entire image is brought to the ground, and all its materials triturated to dust."—p. 72. The iron, clay, brass, silver, and gold, being broken to pieces "together," he contends "does not refer to the *simultaneous* reduction of the materials to dust, but to the *identity of condition* to which they were brought by the process intended."—p. 74.

But is there anything in the original of the words "*smite*," or "broken to pieces," that indicates a long-continued process? O no; he does not present the least criticism on those words; and he even intimates that it may "be said that the evidence of this is not an evidence afforded so much by the literal interpretation of the prophet's recital of the dream, as one reflected back upon it by the assumed exigencies of the subsequent solution."—p. 76. Now we contend that to "*smite*," legitimately denotes sudden and violent action; and unless the word is modified by some adjunct to denote that the action is repeated or continued, the inference is legitimate and irresistible that the effect is the result of a single blow. But, says Professor Bush, "The stone then, as we conceive the drift of the vision, began at the first founding of Christianity, to smite, in a comparatively *gentle* and *feeble* manner, upon the fabric of Roman despotism. It did not wage a direct aggressive warfare upon the system of government then established. It did not forbid, but commanded the rendering to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. It did not preach a crusade against the civil rule of Tiberius or Nero. But it did assert *principles*, and put forth an influence which went gradually to modify and finally to subvert the entire framework of the Roman polity."—p. 126. This, he contends "is required by the exigencies of the imagery, though not in so many words expressly declared in the text."—p. 125.

This exposition, it will be remembered, he is necessitated to, by his denial of the future Advent. But what is there in the past history of the church, that accords with the supposition that it has continued to smite and "pulverize" the Roman empire? Facts show that the church, instead of being the *smiter*, has been trodden under the foot of the Gentiles, has been driven into the wilderness, and has itself been smitten. It can hardly be said to have gently *rubbed* the Image, much less to have smitten it; and if its first collision, with all the momentum it had acquired in its descent from the mountain, produced no perceptible effect upon the Image, how long must it afterwards continue to rub against it, to grind it to powder?

But the Professor admits there is nothing in the text to denote this gradual process, and it is only resorted to on account of "the exigencies" of his theory, which reduces him to "great extremities of solution." The text is plain: the Image was to be smitten on the feet, and with a velocity that will shiver it to atoms: in the days of the toe kingdoms, the kingdom of heaven is to be set up by the advent of its King and the resurrection of the dead—the complete number of God's elect, a number sufficient to replenish the earth: then all these kingdoms will be destroyed, and it will stand forever. Thus the stone becomes—(does not grow to)—a great mountain, and fills the whole earth.

† Professor Bush also contends that the judgment of the fourth Beast is a work as gradual as the demolition of the Image by the stone. In an article on this subject in the Hierophant, he argues that the prediction, "The judgment shall sit and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end," denotes a "progressive work."—p. 134. He concludes that "the sitting of the judgment was *prior* to the coming of the Son of man to the Ancient of days," that "this coming in the clouds of heaven *must* be referred to the Savior's ascension," and that "the consummated possession of the kingdom by the saints was not to occur till *after* the fourth monarchy was wasted away;" therefore, he asks, "how is it possible to resist the inference, that the events here shadowed forth are in fact spread over a very extended duration?"—p. 209.

This conclusion is legitimate if the premises are sound. But is it true that the

without hand,' 'the coming to an end with none to help it,' 'the binding of Satan and the casting of him into the bottomless pit,' &c. &c., none of which would be *selected* as figures symbolical of a long continued and gradual process extending through eighteen centuries.

Again, the long continuance of the process of transfer from the commencement of Christianity, would make Christ's kingdom for a time parallel with the kingdoms of this *age*, which are to give place to it. But the prophecy places it *after* the stone has smitten the image on the *feet*—not on the *legs*,—and no place is found even for any of the constituent dust of the metallic structure—*after* the fourth beast is slain and burned—*after* the kingdoms of this world are come to an end, when Michael shall stand up,—and *after* the passing away of the heavens and earth in the establishment of the New Jerusalem state, &c. We can find the prediction of no such long-continued process in the establishment of Christ's kingdom.

But, when the *epoch* alluded to arrives, says Professor Bush—

"Then it is that the 'kingdoms,' i. e., the rule, power, sway, dominion, which has been so long exercised by these various worldly empires, shall be *made over* to, and merged in, the supreme and universal kingdom of Jesus Christ. And this is precisely the 'end' which the apostle here says is to 'come.' It is the same result with that which is shadowed out in the vision of the Great Image in Daniel, that was broken to pieces, and ground to powder by the stone cut out of the mountain—which itself grew to a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. It is no other than that kingdom of Christ and the saints which displaced and succeeded the kingdoms of the four Beasts, and which also became universal under the whole heavens. Such are clearly the announcements of the Old Testament; and can we suppose that Paul, writing under the guidance of the same Spirit, would announce anything different?"—p. 374.

coming of the Son of man, is his going up to heaven? Professor Bush says the prediction of the angels to the disciples, Acts i. 11, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven," may simply mean that he "should so arrive in heaven, as they had seen him go towards heaven; yet he admits it "is by no means demonstrably certain."—p. 212. The transmutation of this text is produced in "the crucible of philological deduction;" but to us it looks more like a feat of legerdemain. Although the sitting of the judgment is *prior* to the receiving of the kingdom by the Son; so is the slaying of the beast recorded prior to the same event. But the coming of the Ancient of days is subsequent to the reign of the "little horn," which he says "is unquestionably the ecclesiastical power of the Papacy," (p. 109), the time of whose reign he admits is 1260 years; for according to Dan. vii. 21, this horn prevails till the Ancient of days comes. Professor Bush also says, "the inference would seem to be forced upon us, that the judgment visited upon the ten-horned monster, was mainly provoked by the iniquitous acts of which he was guilty during the period, and under the instigation of the Little Horn."—p. 109. And, that "the enormities of the fourth Beast of the vision, his blasphemies, persecutions, and outrages, had become so grievous and heaven-daring, that a speedy divine interposition was called for; and accordingly the whole symbolic scenery indicates an order of proceeding violent and expedite corresponding with the emergency of the occasion."—p. 93. If this reasoning is correct, these events can be no *gradual* process, and must all transpire at or about the end of the fourth beast.

We fully accord with this view, with the exception of one word. It is no where said the stone '*grew* to a great mountain.' It reads :—"And the stone that smote the image *became* a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." There is nothing to show that it was by any slow growth : on the other hand the context would lead us to conclude that immediately upon the disappearance of the entire image, then the stone is as it were at once transformed into a great mountain by the previous simultaneous resurrection of all the righteous dead, who swell the ranks of the righteous living then to be changed,—the subjects of Christ's universal and eternal kingdom.

"Here, then," says Professor Bush, "we have, as we conceive, the true key to the explication of his language. The scope of his intimations is the farthest possible from declaring that Christ is in any sense, or at any time, to 'deliver up' his kingdom. How should he do this, when this kingdom was given him as the *reward* of his humiliation and obedience unto death ! Is his reward to cease as soon as his work is done ? Are the saints to be crowned with an *eternal* reward, and the King of Saints with a *temporary* one ? Shall he cease to be Lord and King at the very time that every knee begins to bow to him, and every tongue confess ! Surely this is the most violent of all suppositions. What conclusion, then, is possible, but that the 'kingdom' here said to be 'delivered up'—which by the way is more properly rendered 'made over'—is the *usurped kingdom* of his enemies, and not his own ?"—p. 375.

The above is a very just and scriptural conclusion, with which we are happy fully to accord. He then argues that the subject of the verb "shall have delivered" cannot be Christ, and that—

"The verb is *used without any personal nominative*, but has reference to the purpose of God, elsewhere expressed in his word. If this point can be completely made out, it will give, as the legitimate result, the following reading of the passage :—'Then cometh the end (the grand consummation), when the prophetic announcements of the Scriptures require the delivering up (the making over) of all adverse dominion into the hands of God, or the Godhead (the Father and the Son conjointly), to whose unrivalled supremacy every thing is to be made finally subject.' This brings the oracle into parallelism with Rev. xi. 15, 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms' [kingdom] 'of our Lord and his Christ.'"—p. 375.

This disposition of the verb respecting its nominative, he endeavors to sustain by the following rule :—

"Active verbs, especially of the third person singular (frequently also in the plural), in many cases assume the signification of the passive, *where no nominative is expressed*."—p. 376.

The *correctness* of this *rule* he establishes by various citations from the Scriptures. But this rule is applicable only

"where *no nominative is expressed*;" but in the present text a nominative is at least implied, "*he shall have delivered up*," and Professor Bush does not intimate that the '*he*' is not correctly inserted in the translation. But as we come to substantially the same conclusion respecting the delivering up of the kingdom, it may be asked how we would avoid this difficulty? It is by the "general sense" of the phrase 'deliver up,' which according to Professor Bush is "*making over, transferring*," which obtains elsewhere in the New Testament. The definition of our English word 'deliver' is very different from that which is usually assigned to it in this connection. According to Dr. Webster it is, 1, "To free, to release as from restraint, to set at liberty." 2, "To *rescue* or save." 3, "To give or *transfer*," which, according to Professor Bush, and also Professor Mills of Andover, is the sense of its original. "To *surrender*, to yield, to give up, to resign," are given by Webster as only the fourth signification of the term. Thus the 'delivering up of the kingdom' is the *rescuing* it from the usurpers that now administer its government, from the prince of the power of the air, and the *restoring* it to its rightful Lord.

We read that when God created the earth he pronounced all things very good. And its Creator, by virtue of his creative power was then the rightful King of the new domain. But the kingdom of this earth apostatized from its rightful Sovereign, and for six thousand years has been in a state of *rebellion*: it is a revolted kingdom. But God has made provision for its restoration. Coeval with the commencement of the Serpent's reign, the promise was given that the seed of the woman should bruise his head, and God hath continued to predict, by the mouth of all the holy prophets that have spoken, the restoration of this earth to its Eden state under Emmanuel's reign. It was only seen in the distant future as a bright vision of eternal glory, with no defined time for its consummation, and with no predicted consecutive events to its completion, until the thoughts came into the mind of the proud monarch of Babylon, as he reclined upon his bed, respecting "what should come to pass hereafter." And the God in heaven that revealeth secrets, made 'known unto king Nebuchadnezzar what should be in the latter days.' He showed him under the symbol of a great 'Image,' that four great empires were to succeed each other, which should each in their order bear rule over the whole earth, that the last was to as-

sume a 'decem-regal' form as symbolized by the toes of the image, and that when it had passed through these successive changes, a mighty Stone would dash the entire Image to pieces by smiting it on its *feet*; and the God of heaven would again set up his kingdom to fill the whole earth,—it being then rescued from the dominion of its usurpers. The same order of events was again and again presented, with the same glorious consummation, for the comfort and encouragement of God's waiting children. And at length it pleased the Father to respond to the question, 'How long shall be the vision?' and the prophet was made to understand that it should be unto twenty-three hundred prophetic days, when the earth should be redeemed, and but sixty-nine prophetic weeks to the Messiah the Prince. "When the fulness of the *time* was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." He suffered in his own person the consequences of the *fall*, paid the price of the revolted province with his own blood, and has promised to redeem the possession, thus purchased, by destroying all the works of the Devil. His first victory over the prince of darkness was when he broke the bands of death, and arose the first fruits of those that slept, when he came off conquering and to conquer—his resurrection being a pledge of the resurrection of all his saints when the times of refreshing shall come. He then ascended on high and took his seat at the right hand of the Father, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, where he will reign until he shall put all enemies under his feet, shall rescue the kingdom from the hands of the usurper, and restore it to his Father, who will set his Son its King, upon the holy hill of Zion;—the heathen having been given to him—his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth—his possession; and the angels having gathered out of his kingdom all things that offend. Then 'the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him.'

"For he must reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet." This is supposed by some to denote that when all enemies are put under his feet, that he will then cease to reign. The following texts, however, are presented by Professor Bush to show that such is not necessarily the use of "until."

"1 Sam. xv. 35. 'Samuel came no more until the day of his death.' Of course, he *never* came again.

2 Sam. vi. 23. 'Therefore Michal, the daughter of Saul, had no child *unto*' " [the same word] " 'the day of her death.'

Psa. cxii. 8. 'His heart is established, he shall not be afraid, *until* he see his desire upon his enemies.'

Isa. xxii. 14. 'Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you *till* ye die.'

Isa. xlii. 4. 'He shall not fail nor be discouraged, *till* he have set judgment in the earth.'

Isa. xlii. 4. 'Even *to*' " [the same word] " 'your old age I am he.'

Matt. v. 18. " *Till* heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.' Does this imply that any part of the law shall fail, even supposing heaven and earth shall pass away?

Matt. xxviii. 20. 'Lo, I am with you always, even *unto* the end of the world.' Would he cease to be with them then?

Rom. v. 13. 'Until the law, sin was in the world.' It surely did not leave the world then."—pp. 379. 380.

Consequently if he shall reign *till* he hath put all enemies under his feet, there will be then nothing to prevent his reigning: it will be then uninterrupted.

"The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Professor Bush understands "death" here, "not as synonymous with *mortality* in the abstract, but with *premature mortality*;" that death will no longer be "an enemy," or "a curse"—"not that men will then *cease to die*," but that "it will then become to the great mass of men a mere gentle metamorphosis, or, more properly, a virtual translation from the mundane to the celestial mansions."

We however must believe the positive declaration of the Revelator that "THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH." But Prof. Bush is *obliged* to assume his interpretation, to *avoid* in the context the doctrine of the resurrection. Professor Mills renders it, "He shall destroy the last enemy, death," i. e. the last enemy of the saints, their bodies being no longer holden of it.

The other portions of this passage are comparatively clear, and are not here subjects of dispute. With the above explanation the whole passage "is in entire harmony with the general scope of the prophetic Scriptures relative to the duration and destiny" of our Lord's everlasting kingdom. The following paraphrase expresses our understanding of this portion of Scripture*:—The apostle had been just speaking of the

* The following is Professor Mills' translation of this passage.

"Then cometh the end, when he shall re-establish the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall subdue all [opposing] rule and all authority and power: for

victory which Christ, at his coming, shall obtain over death by the rescue of his people from the power of death, in their glorious resurrection; and having declared the fact of such deliverance, he proceeds:—Then [at Christ's coming] cometh the end, [or consummation, that glorious result to which the promises of God and the hopes of Christians are specially directed,] when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom [having destroyed all the works of the devil, and rescued it from his dominion] to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all [opposing] rule, and all authority and power. For he [Christ] must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy shall be destroyed—death: for he hath put all things under his [Christ's] feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he [the Father] is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him [Christ,] then shall the Son also himself [as before, still continue to] be subject unto him [the Father] that put all things under him, that God may [continue to] be all in all."

In the concluding chapter of his work Professor Bush briefly recapitulates the principal points in his argument from reason, which, as we have already noticed, will not again be made the subject of individual comment. A few of his remarks, however, we cannot thus pass over. In reference to his philosophical conclusions, he asks:—

"If our conclusions are authoritative to our own minds, can we set them aside when we come to deal with the letter of Holy Writ? Is not the light of human reason as truly kindled by the Spirit of God, as the light of divine revelation? Is there the highest criminality in going counter to the one, and none in going counter to the other? If so, why!—on what grounds?—p. 389.

We admit that the "light of human reason" is "*kindled* by the Spirit of God," but we deny that it is always *directed* by the same Spirit: an opposite spirit often shapes and controls "human reason," as the course of a majority of the race fully demonstrates. The "light" of divine revelation is never thus mis-directed. While therefore we may know we are criminal in going counter to the one, we may be acting wisely in

he must reign until he put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy, death, shall be destroyed; for he [the Father] hath [by decree] subjected all things beneath his feet. But since it is said all things have been subjected, it is plain that He is excepted who did subject all things to him. But when all things shall be [actually] subjected, even then the Son himself shall be subject to Him, who did subject all things to him, that God may be all in all."—*Henry Mills D. D. Prof. Bib. Lit. An. Theo. Sem.—Bib. Repos. Vol. 3d. p. 753.*

going counter to the conclusions of the other ; for there never was an error promulgated, but the "*reason*" of some of the human race has bowed to it. Were human reason never defective, we might always abide by it ; but among the multiplicity of opinions, where can we look for *truth* but to the word of God alone. If we could fully realize how little we actually know, we should be less ready to place human reason by the side of divine revelation. Says Mr. Locke :—

"Our knowledge being so narrow, it will perhaps give us some light into the present state of our minds, if we look a little into the dark side, and take a view of our ignorance, which, being infinitely greater than our knowledge, may serve much to the quieting of disputes and improvements of useful knowledge ; if, discovering how far we have clear and distinct ideas, we confine our thoughts within the contemplation of those things that are within the reach of our understanding, and launch not out into that abyss of darkness where we have not eyes to see, nor faculties to perceive any thing ; out of a presumption that nothing is beyond our comprehension.—But to be satisfied of the folly of such a conceit, we need not go far."—*Locke Hum. Underst. IV. iii. § 22.*

Says Dr. Good :—

"It is one part of science, and not the least important, though the lowest and most elementary, to become duly acquainted with the nature and extent of our ignorance upon whatever subject we propose to investigate ; and it is probably for want of a proper attention to this branch of study, that we meet with so many crude and confident theories upon questions that the utmost wit or wisdom of man is utterly incapable of elucidating. The rude uninstructed peasant, or ignorant pretender, believes that he understands everything before him ; the experienced philosopher knows that he understands nothing. It was so in Greece, and will be so in every age and country : while the sophists of Athens asserted their pretensions to universal knowledge, Socrates, in opposition to them, was daily affirming that the only thing he knew to a certainty was his own ignorance."—*Book of Nature, p. 322.*

Now although man may be very learned and profound, yet the Maker of man is more learned and profound than he ; and as the results to which the most wise and learned have arrived,—the various theories and systems which at times have captivated the world, and then each in their turn given place to others,—have so often been proved to be defective, when

new light has dawned ; so any theory which positively contradicts the inspired word, *may* in its turn also be found to be *defective*. We therefore prefer to abide by the letter of the Scriptures ; for should it be proved at last that we have adhered too closely to the sacred text, we should have an excuse we should not be ashamed to offer at the divine tribunal ; but if we should err on the other hand, we should be without excuse. We cannot therefore assent to the following conclusion :

"On the whole, we are unable to perceive that the principle is not a sound one, which makes the ascertained truth of physical and psychical science, the criterion by which to judge of the import of revealed truth, falling within the same department."—p. 389.

We do not conceive that it is a sound principle, because when the Bible asserts "the bodies of the saints arose," a *supposed* ascertained truth may deny it. And we had rather take the alternative, that "we can be more certain of the meaning of the Spirit," when it is clearly and positively enunciated, although it may teach "doctrines contrary to our deductions, than we can be, of the truth of those deductions themselves."

Another argument here adduced is, that "*Anastasis*," the leading word by which the resurrection is indicated, merely denotes "a new sphere of existence," and not the "restoration of a suspended bodily life ;" and,—

"With this ruling sense of the term, the truth or the fallacy of the theory becomes, therefore, in great measure, a question of *pure philology*, and by the verdict which a fair and enlightened criticism renders on the subject, it must stand or fall."—p. 392.

However much this may be a question of "*philology*," one thing is certain ; i. e. when the positive declarations of Scripture have been submitted to the criticism of the Professor, he has, as we have seen in numerous instances, admitted that there was a resurrection *asserted*, and that the sense which he is "constrained to put upon the *letter* of the sacred record may be different from that which is most natively obvious, and such as would never have occurred" to him but from its conflict with his theory ; while on the other hand he has not once claimed that he has *demonstrated* the certainty of his deductions from science, but only assumes a great degree of *probability*. So that the question finally resolves itself to this, *Shall we receive the positive enunciations of Scripture, or shall we set them aside by deductions which at best are only probable ?* After all our researches, and philosophical and

philological criticisms, we must abide by one of those alternatives.

We have thus gone over the entire work of Professor Bush with as much minuteness as we had time and space to devote to it. We have endeavored to state all his prominent arguments fairly, and as fully as was practicable. We have wished to see and to admit the full force of any and all objections which could be adduced against this glorious doctrine. If we are in any measure in error, we wish to obey the dictates of truth; and we are conscious of no desire to sustain any favorite tenet of our own at the expense of truth. While Professor Bush pleads "not guilty to the charge of a morbid *cacoethes innovandi*," and has no "desire of hunting after and minting new" theories, "by reason of a profane loathing of anciently received truth," so we also plead not guilty to any similar charge, or to that of adhering to any theory because it is old, or of rejecting any because it may be an innovation upon established views. While we wish to submit every theological question to "the crucible of logical and philological induction," we also wish to submit each and all "to the Law and the Testimony: *if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them*,"—Isa. viii. 20. And this word must be so written that its *native import* can be made plain to the understanding of man, or so frequent reference would not be made to what is there *written*. "What is written in the law?" said our Savior to the lawyer, Luke x. 20, "How readest thou?" St. Paul avowed his belief in "all things which are *written* in the Law and the Prophets,"—Acts xxiv. 14. Says our Savior, Luke xxiv. 44, 46, "These are the *words* which I *spake* unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were *written* in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." "Thus it is *written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." And, Matt. v. 18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Frequent reference is made to the reading of the Scriptures, and what is written therein. "The Scripture was fulfilled which saith,"—"Hath not the Scripture said,"—"And the Scripture cannot be broken,"—"What saith the Scriptures?"—"Do you think the Scripture saith in vain?"—"Have ye never read in the Scriptures?"—"Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures,"—"Search the Scriptures," &c. Would such frequent reference be made to the

Oracles of God, if another "criterion" was to supersede them? or if the native import of the words in which the sacred teachings are expressed, as understood by the Jews of that age, would not convey to us the true understanding of the divine communications? If the revelations of God were so shrouded in an obscure diction, that all men, everywhere, for four thousand years, not excepting inspired prophets and apostles, should attach a meaning to the words not sustained by the actual truth, would it not be strange that our Savior should accuse them, when they departed from the *letter* of the law, of "transgressing the commandment of God by their traditions"? of "making the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions"? Paul commanded the church, 1 Cor. xi. 2, "to keep the traditions as he delivered them." The faith which the apostles believed, embraced the resurrection of the body; and we are commanded "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." The apostle charged them "to preach no other doctrine," and those "which caused divisions contrary to the doctrine they *had learned*, they were to avoid"; and says Paul, Gal. i. 8, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." He commanded Timothy to "hold fast the *form of sound words*, which thou hast heard from me," "and the things that thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Therefore when we read that in the *last days* "they will not endure sound doctrine," "will depart from the faith;" and are cautioned "to keep that committed to our trust, avoiding the oppositions of science falsely so called," it makes us very suspicious of any view of the divine word, which is in opposition to what it is admitted all the prophets and apostles believed, and which denies the native import of the plain letter of the text.

Having thus presented the various objections to "the doctrine of the resurrection"—the view of Professor Bush being only "the doctrine of elimination"—we will briefly present in connection the several Scriptures which more particularly sustain it—the objections to which have already been considered.

Gen. xvii. 8, "I will give unto *thee* and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an *everlasting possession*." Ex. vi. 2—4, "And God spake un-

to Moses and said unto him, I am the Lord; and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob," "and I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers." Luke xx. 37, 38, "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Acts vii. 2—5, "The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran, and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land wherein ye now dwell. And he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised to give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." The harmony of these several texts alone are sufficient to prove that "Abraham" and "his seed" who "died in faith not having received the promise," will surely again be raised to possess that land.

Job xix. 25, 26. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."

Psa. xvii. 15. "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness."

Isa. xxv. 7—9. "And he will destroy in this mountain, the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off all the earth: for the Lord God hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us." 1 Cor. xv. 51—54, "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" This last portion of Scripture is exegetical of the former.

Isa. xxvi. 19, 21. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise; awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." "For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity:

the earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."

Ezek. xxxvii. 11, 12. "Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: Behold, say they, our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts. Therefore prophesy unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel."

Dan. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Luke vii. 12—15. "Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out." And the Lord "came and touched the bier: and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother."

John xi. 43, 44. "And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth! And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes."

Matt. xxvii. 52, 53. "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this: for the time is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto [at] the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto [at] the resurrection of damnation."

John vi. 40. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."

Matt. xxvii. 59—66. "And when Joseph had taken the body [of Jesus], he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed." "Now the next day that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead." "So they went and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

Matt. xxviii. 1—9. "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre." ["And they

found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre.”—*Luke*.] [“And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting,” “and were affrighted.”—*Mark*] “And the angel answered and said unto the woman, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus *which was crucified*. He is not here; *for he is risen*, as he said, Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that **HE IS RISEN FROM THE DEAD**.” “And as they went to tell his disciples, behold Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.” “After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.”—*Mark* xvi. 12. “Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and said unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.”—*John* xx. 19, 20. And he said, “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” “And he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them.”—*Luke* xxiv. 39—43. “And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.”—*John* xx. 26, 27. “After these things Jesus showed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberius.” “This is now the third time that Jesus showed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.”—xxi. 1, 14.

Acts x. 39—41. “Whom they slew and hanged on a tree, him God raised the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before by God, even to us, who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead.”

1 Cor. xv. 3—23. “For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.” “Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your

faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming."

Acts iv. 1, 2. "And while they were speaking to the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead."

Acts xvii. 18, 32. "And some said, What will this babbler say? some others, He seemeth to be a setter-forth of strange gods: because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection." "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked."

Acts xxiv. 14, 15, 21. "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." "Concerning the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day."

1 Cor. vi. 14. "And God hath raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power."

Rom. viii. 11, 23. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." "Even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body."

1 Thess. iv. 13—17. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

Phil. iii. 21. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."

2 Tim. ii. 16—18. "But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness; and their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some."

Luke xiv. 13, 14. "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

Luke xx. 34—36. "And Jesus answering, said unto them, the children of this world [*age*] marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

Phil. iii. 10, 11. "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means, I might attain unto the resurrection of [out from among] the dead."

Heb. xi. 35. "Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection."

Rev. xx. 4—6. "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the Beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Acts xvi. 8. "*Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?*"

The above are the passages which more prominently refer to the doctrine of the resurrection. The predictions are plain and positive, and clearly enunciated. They constitute "the law and the testimony" respecting this doctrine, with which word, if any theory on this subject agree not, it is because there is no light in it. No person free from bias would venture to assert that the idea of the resurrection of the body is not there affirmed. Even Professor Bush does not deny but that in many instances, after a most critical analysis of the language of the text, the idea of the resurrection of deceased

bodies is therein contained. He admits that the Jews believed in the resurrection of the body, the revivification of that which is deposited in the ground, and that they attached no other signification to the language of the prophets, but in accordance with this doctrine ; that the apostles themselves understood the teachings of Christ to foreshadow the same event ; that they actually believed the body of Christ was raised from the tomb, and that all would be thus raised : and the earliest authority he presumes to bring, in support of the *antiquity* of his belief, are the "heretics" to whom Justin Martyr refers in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew. That is the earliest gleam of light he can find in the primitive age.

Thus we have on the one side, the natural construction which the vast majority of men have almost unanimously put upon the sacred text, and the belief in the resurrection of the body by those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and by those who sat under their teachings, both Jew and Gentile : which belief was received as the true faith by the ancient saints, and was transmitted from them through the church even to the present day. And what have we on the other side ? Why, we have the arguments, that the constituent particles of the human body are continually varying, and are entirely changing and displacing its material, so that we have possessed many bodies, and those we once inhabited have been entirely dissipated and entered into other combinations,—that the same particles may successively enter into the combinations of many bodies, so that there will be a question to whom they will finally belong, and which of the bodies we have inhabited will be raised,—and that it is impossible to discover the connection or perpetuity of identity between the body that is laid aside and the resurrection body ; with other similar physiological arguments. With these we have the argument from Scripture, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, to prove that that kingdom is set up in a world inhabited only by flesh and blood ; and the testimony of the false witnesses, that Christ would be raised with another body. These arguments, which Dr. Nelson terms Infidel objections,—not dreaming that any Christian would ever use them,—and these Scriptures, sustained as they are by the creed of the "heretics" of Justin Martyr's day, are the foundation of the superstructure which is to be reared against the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. If therefore we would occupy the ground that right reason would dictate, in view of all this evi-

35*

dence, we must continue still to adhere to the faith of the apostles, that is so clearly presented in the letter of the text.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

This is a doctrine so intimately connected with those of the resurrection, judgment, and end of the world, which have respectively been so fully discussed in the pages under review, that all the ground in support of the resurrection of the body cannot be occupied without adverting to the evidence by which the personal advent at the resurrection of the just is sustained. We are surprised that Professor Bush has not devoted a portion of the body of his work to the consideration of this question, as his argument cannot be made out unless this is disproved. In his preface he says:—

“The reader will perhaps be prompted to inquire, why, as I have treated the Resurrection in connection with the Judgment, I have not also displayed it in its definite relations to the Second Advent, with which it would appear to be equally intimately associated in the great ~~scope~~ *scope* of Eschatology? * To this I reply, that an accurate examination of what I have advanced on the general subject, will readily disclose my own opinion that the Second Advent of the Savior is not affirmed to be *personal*, but *spiritual* and *providential*, and that the event so denominated, is to be considered as having entered upon its incipient fulfillment at a very early period of the Christian dispensation. To this view I shall be compelled to adhere, so long as the declaration stands unrepealed—‘Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death † till they see the Son of man *coming* in his kingdom.’ If the word of inspiration can be shown to contain the announcement of any *other* second coming than that which *commenced* in the life-time of the generation then living; and if this can be proved to be truly a *second*, instead of a *third* coming, I shall be ready at once to embrace it.”—p. 9.

If the doctrine of a personal advent was sustained only by inferences drawn from two or three disputed passages, as is the argument adduced in disproof of it, we should relinquish it at once. But as it is not thus weakly sustained, and as its truth and the truth of the resurrection of the body are dependent upon the truth of each other, we feel justified in this connection, to sustain the doctrine of the resurrection by the Scriptural evidence that there is to be a future personal advent at the resurrection of life.

* “The doctrine of the last things.”

† “Death,” says Professor Bush in another place, “is here to be understood in precisely the same sense—not as synonymous with mortality in the abstract, but with *premature* mortality.” “It is not that men will then *cease to die*,” “but death will then be deprived of his sting, and the grave of its victory.”—pp. 380, 381. If this is a correct rule there applied, it would obviate the objection brought to bear against the present text, i. e., according to Professor Bush’s rule, they might still die, but were not to die prematurely.

We have already given the evidence on page 375, that the text on which Professor Bush relies, is no proof that the second advent is past, and that it had no reference to his second advent, but to a miniature representation of his coming and kingdom ; which we deem sufficient to settle the question that Christ's transfiguration was for the purpose of giving some who stood there a glimpse of the kingdom of God, in proof of the reality of Christ's second advent ; and that it was what they were to see before they saw death. But as this was fulfilled about an eight days after, and *during* Christ's first advent, it cannot be the *second* coming referred to, for he could not come the second time until he had been absent after the first ; consequently a future coming would not be a *third*, but a *second* advent.

But notwithstanding the evidence which was presented to Peter on the mount, that the coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ is no cunningly devised fable, he says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." Peter makes the "word of prophecy" even "more sure" than that which he saw and heard for himself. We will therefore have recourse to the testimony of the prophets ; and we may do, in this connection, but little more than to present the words of "the prophecy" that "came not at any time by the will of man, but by holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

As many of the acts, predicted in the Scriptures to be performed by the Savior, were not performed at his first advent, it is necessary that there should be a second coming to finish the great plan of salvation. The first intimation we have of the second advent is in Gen. iii. 15, "And I will put enmity between thee [the serpent] and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." To bruise the heel denotes a partial victory ; but to bruise the head of an enemy denotes his entire destruction. Some contend that in Christ's crucifixion he bruised the serpent's head. But that must be a strange victory over another which resulted in the death of the victor. This, however, we regard as the fulfilment of that part of the promise that Satan will bruise Christ's heel. The head of Satan cannot yet have been bruised ; for he still goes about as a roaring lion deceiving the children of

men. But when Christ shall bind him and cast him into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are to be tormented day and night for ever and ever, Rev. xx. 10, his head will be effectually bruised. And this must be at Christ's second advent.

We read in Numbers, xxiv. 17, "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, that shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." This has always been considered by commentators as a prediction of Christ's advent; and as these events were not fulfilled under his first, they must have respect to his second coming.

Job testified, xix. 25, "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." This he connects with his resurrection; for he says that after the worms have destroyed his body, he shall see God in his flesh.

In the 2d Psalm, speaking of the future, God says, "yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen—thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth—thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This must refer to the destruction of the wicked at Christ's second coming; and it can afford but little evidence of the world's conversion, in support of which it is so often adduced.

Psalm l. 3—5. "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice."

Psalm xcvi. 11—13. "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord: for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth."

Psalm lxxxix. 34—37. "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." This can only have respect to Christ as the Heir to David's throne. Thus the angel spake to Mary, Luke i. 31—33. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over

the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." This must be the everlasting kingdom that is to come, and is to be set up under the whole heaven. And James declares, Acts xv. 16, that this is to be after God has taken out of the Gentiles a people for his name—"After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up"; which he says agrees with the words of the prophets.

Isaiah, after bringing to view the resurrection, when death will be swallowed up in victory, says, xxv. 9, "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord, we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Again, in a subsequent chapter, after showing that the earth will cast out her dead, and that the dead men of Zion will arise with his dead body, he adds, xxvi. 21, "For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity."

Daniel, after showing us the destruction of the fourth beast and all human governments, says, vii. 13, 14, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." This must be a future coming; for it is after the destruction of the horn of papacy; and it must be the same coming referred to by Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 8, when the Man of Sin will be destroyed,—that Wicked "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." Also, according to Daniel, Christ's kingdom is to succeed the present governments of the world, is to dash them to pieces, and to take their place; and in the 12th chapter he shows us that it is when the many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, that Michael is to stand up, when all human government shall come to its end, and none to help it.

Zech. xiv. 34. "Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east." We then read that "the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." And the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one."

Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 29, 30, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?*" "For as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming* of the Son

* In this, and in all the subsequent passages quoted in this connection, the word *coming*, when it is indicated by an asterisk (*) is from the Greek word *parousia*, de-

of Man be." "Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn. And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."

Matt. xxiv. 37—39. "But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming * of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming * of the Son of man be."

Luke xvii. 26—30. "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all; even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed."

Luke xix. 11, 12. "And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable: because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said therefore, a certain Nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." This Nobleman must be the Lord Jesus Christ; and this parable is evidently spoken to correct the impression that his coming was to be an event of that day.

Mark. xiii. 34. "For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house and gave authority to his servants and to every man his work; and commanded the porter to watch."

Matt. xxv. 31, 34. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." "Then shall the King say unto them on the right hand, come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

John xiv. 3. "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will

noting his actual *epiphany* and *personal revelation*. That word is used but twenty-four times in the New Testament, seventeen of which are here quoted in reference to Christ's coming. In the remaining seven places where the same word occurs, no one will deny that it has reference to the actual personal *presence* or *arrival* of the person to whom it is applied, as the following instances of its use will show. 1 Cor. xvi. 17, "I am glad of the coming of Stephanus and Fortunatus and Achaicus." 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7,—"God comforted us by the coming of Titus; and not by his coming only." 2 Cor. x. 10—"But his bodily presence is weak." Phil. i. 26—"That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again." Phil. ii. 12,—"Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence." Phil. v. 9,—"Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan."—See *Literalist*, Vol. 3, p. 129. This must establish the *usus loquendi* of the word; and if it denotes the personal presence in every other instance of its use in the New Testament, it must when used in reference to the Savior's coming.

come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Acts. i. 11. "Which also said, ye men of Gallilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Acts iii. 20, 21. "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began."

1 Cor. i. 7, 8, "So that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."

1 Cor. xv. 20, 23. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." *

Phil. iii. 20. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ."

Col. iii. 4. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

1 Thess. i. 9, 10. "Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living God and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come."

1 Thess. ii. 19. "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming." *

1 Thess. iii. 13. "To the end that he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming * of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints."

1 Thess. iv. 14—17. "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming * of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."

1 Thess. v. 23. "I pray God your whole spirit and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming * of the Lord."

2 Thess. i. 7, 8. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Thess. ii. 1. "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the com-

ing * of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him."

2 Thess. iii. 5. "And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ."

2 Thess. v. 8. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." *

1 Tim. vi. 14, 15. "That thou keep this commandment without spot unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords."

2 Tim. iv. 1, 8. "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

Titus ii. 13. "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ."

Heb. ix. 28. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation."

James v. 7, 8. "Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming * of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming * of the Lord draweth nigh."

1 Pet. i. 7, 13. "That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ." "Wherefore gird up the loins of your minds, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

1 Pet. v. 4. "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

2 Pet. i. 16. "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming * of our Lord Jesus Christ."

2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, 12. "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" * "Looking for and hastening unto the coming * of the day of God."

1 John ii. 28. "That when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming." *

1 John iii. 2. "Behold, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

Jude 14, 15. "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, proph-

sied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all."

Rev. i. 7. "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him; and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall mourn because of him."

Rev. xi. 15, 18. "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth."

Rev. xxi. 3. "And I heard a voice from heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God."

Rev. xxii. 20. "He which testifieth these things, saith, Surely I come quickly; Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Matt. xiii. 30, 39—43. "Let both (the tares and the wheat) grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, gather together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn."

"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world [*aiōnos—age*]; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

The above texts, to any who will admit the "native import" of their language, must settle the question, that at the time assigned for the resurrection of the just and the regeneration of the earth, there will be the personal appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick and the dead and reign upon the throne of his father David for ever and ever. They also plainly show that this appearing was the great event for which the early Christians and martyrs prayed, which they ardently desired, and for which they waited with earnest expectation. That this is the true exposition of those texts has been admitted by the church in all ages, excepting these last

days ; and it was never questioned by the pious, for the first five hundred years after Christ.

And how can their native import be obviated ? It is only attempted to be by the supposition, that these glorious predictions, in which Christ's personal appearing and presence are asserted, only have reference to his spiritual appearing, his invisible coming to destroy Jerusalem, his coming at death, or his providential coming. But any such application comes far short of the event indicated by the glowing language of the text.

That the glorious epiphany here predicted is not the coming of Christ at death, is evident from the fact that at death, instead of Christ's coming to us, we "depart" "to be with Christ," (Phil. i. 23.) And the apostle assures us that when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, all the dead in Christ will be raised to life, and the righteous living will be changed, (1st Thess. iv. 16,) so that Christ's coming, instead of being the signal of death, is the signal for the resurrection from the dead.

That these predictions have no reference to a coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, is evident from the fact that the Apocalypse was written about twenty-six years after that event, and in that are contained predictions of his future coming. Also, in the 24th chapter of Matthew's Gospel, we find that the very signs that were to *precede* his coming were not to be seen until *after* the tribulation, which commenced with the destruction of that city, and continued through the Pagan and Papal persecutions. That they can have reference to no providential or spiritual coming, is also evident from the fact that Christ is never spiritually or providentially absent. He has promised to be with us even to the end of the world, and as he has never left the world by his Spirit, he cannot be said to come spiritually *again* ; for how can that which is with us, be said to *come* to us ? Besides, such, instead of being his *second* coming, would be a *multiplicity* of comings.

That the coming of Christ can be no spiritual or providential coming at death, the destruction of Jerusalem, or in any other invisible way, is also evident from the signs which were to precede it, which to such events would be entirely inapplicable ; and our Savior has expressly cautioned us, that if any say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there," we are to "believe it not" ; and "if they shall say to you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not

forth ; behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not.—For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even to the west ; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. And they shall *see* the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven.”—Matt. xxiv. 23, 27, 30. Consequently the coming of the Lord can only have reference to his personal and glorious appearing in his kingdom. If the coming of Christ is personal and literal, the Resurrection and the Restitution of all things at the end of this age, must be of a nature to correspond. And before Professor Bush can disprove the doctrine of the Resurrection, he must also do away with the literal fulfilment of any and all of these coetaneous events, each of which is, independent of the others, sustained by the most overwhelming and positive testimony of the Word of God. But as we conceive that he has signally failed in producing evidence from the Scriptures, or from reason, to disprove the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, or of either of these kindred events, we must continue still to believe that they are immutable truths, sustained by the Divine testimony. We therefore believe that it is incumbent upon us, like the saints of old, to live in “the patient waiting for Christ,” who will raise all the righteous from their dusty beds, and judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom. May God hasten that glorious consummation.

The only remaining topic of interest, the conflagration of the earth, which is legitimately connected with the doctrine of the Resurrection, is considered in the following article, in which we have reviewed a disquisition in the “Hierophant,” from the pen of Professor Bush on that subject.

ARTICLE XVI.

The Conflagration of the Heavens and Earth. A Review of “The Millennium and New Jerusalem, by Geo. Bush.”

Under the title of “The Millennium and New Jerusalem,” we find an argument in the “Hierophant,” by Prof. Bush, which is so legitimately connected with the doctrine of the Resurrection, that we have thought best to review it in connection with the subject of the preceding article.

The question of a literal conflagration of the earth is so nearly allied to the doctrines of the Resurrection, Second Advent, &c., that in an article in the New York Tribune, of January 24th, Professor Bush says, if "the usual sense put upon the phrase 'end of the world,' as implying the physical conflagration of the globe we inhabit," be true, "there is no possible alternative between it and the theory of Millerism, except, perhaps, in regard to the precise day or year."

Professor Bush assumes—

"That the New Jerusalem state, as described both by Isaiah and by John, is locally an earthly state—a dispensation, economy, or polity, to be developed on the material globe that we now inhabit."—p. 49.

To this proposition we fully subscribe. The nature of this future dispensation and of the events which will usher it in, are the questions here at issue. He says:—

"We affirm that the beatific state of things announced in the predictions of Isaiah—when the desert shall bud and blossom as the rose—when the valleys shall be exalted, and the mountains and hills made low—when the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain—when the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together—when the Gentiles shall come to the light of Zion, and kings to the brightness of her rising—when instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier, the myrtle-tree—when for brass shall be brought gold, for iron silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron—when Jerusalem shall be created a rejoicing and her people a joy—when the voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying—when the wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and they shall no more hurt nor destroy in all the Lord's holy mountain—that this state is identical with the New Jerusalem of John. The proof of this can only be made palpable by a tabellated display of the parallelisms occurring in the two prophets which we now present to the reader."

JOHN xxi. 1, 2.

And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away, and there was no more sea.

And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

JOHN xxi. 19, 20.

And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald;

ISAIAH lxxv. 17, 18.

For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind.

But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.

ISAIAH liv. 11, 12.

O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted! behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires.

The fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst.

JOHN xxi. 23.

And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.

xxii. 5.

And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever.

JOHN xxi. 24—26.

And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.

And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there.

And they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it.

JOHN xxi. 4.

And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.

And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones.

ISAIAH lx. 19, 20.

The sun shall be no more thy light by day: neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory.

Thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself: for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.

ISAIAH lx. 3, 11.

And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.

Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought.

ISAIAH lxxv. 19, 20.

And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying.

There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner, being an hundred years old, shall be accursed.

Hierophant, pp. 8—12.

The above Scriptures prove conclusively that the parallel passages are descriptive of the same glorious period. But the question here arises whether they are descriptive of a probationary state, or of the glorious kingdom of the risen saints? Professor Bush contends for the former. His argument is, that, of this state it is said—

“There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall

build houses and inhabit them ; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit ; they shall not plant, and another eat : for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble ; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them. And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer ; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock : and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.'—Isa. lrv. 20—25.

This most assuredly is the picture of a *mundane* state of things, and it is only by a downright violence done to the text that it can be *spiritualized* into a prediction of the purely celestial blessedness. But if the new creation of John is *identical* with this of Isaiah—and on what principle of exegesis can it be shown to be different!—then John also describes a *terrestrial* economy, and his mystic city can only be said to come down out of heaven from God, on the ground of its being developed into existence in execution of the divine purposes."—p. 9.

All of the above we admit ; and yet the question arises whether it is a probationary state on the earth, or the resurrection state on the earth ? That it is the latter, is settled by the testimony of John, who gives us "the unequivocal assurance that 'THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH,' there." It follows, then, that if the two states are *identical*, there can be no death in the state described by Isaiah. But, says the Professor :—

"God alone could make known the future to either, and we see no good reason for ascribing to John or Peter a higher grade of foresight or infallibility than to Isaiah, Ezekiel, or Daniel ; nor, if the one is to be interpreted by the other, do we know any grounds on which we should be required to interpret Isaiah by John, rather than John by Isaiah. Indeed, if that necessity should be supposed, we should, for ourselves, feel warranted of the two to give the preference to the former, inasmuch as both Christ and the Apostles continually refer to the Old Testament annunciations as *fulfilled* in their doctrines and disclosures, and inasmuch as the very title of John's predictions, 'Apocalypse,' implies the *unveiling* or *revelation* of the mystic and hidden sense of the prophetic oracles, previously uttered by his inspired predecessors. The Old Testament predictions are plainly regarded as the most *original* of the two, and in all professed paraphrases, explanations, and expansions of the sense of *original documents*, we feel at liberty to compare for ourselves the pure originals with the avowed expositions, even though these expositions come to us bearing the stamp of divine inspiration. If both are actually inspired, it is possible that the former may in some points reflect light upon the latter, as well as the latter upon the former."—pp. 8, 9.

That the former may reflect light on the latter, is not denied ; but, if we are to have respect only to the *earliest* prediction, is it not setting aside subsequent explanations ? If the predictions of Isaiah needed no explanation, the revelations of John would have been uncalled for. And as both

spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, the very fact that God saw fit to give a subsequent revelation respecting the same points, is evidence that this subsequent revelation was necessary for the correct understanding of the former. We are to remember that the same Divine Mind is the *author* of both prophecies, so that to interpret the earliest prophecy irrespective of the subsequent explanation, would be like explaining some of Professor Bush's earlier writings irrespective of his subsequent explications of them: even if it should be in opposition to positive interpretations he may himself have made. He would hardly relish such liberties with his productions; and yet it is the liberty he takes with the revelations of God!

Again, the claim that Professor Bush makes for the liberty to compare for himself the two prophecies, no one would deny. But if he means,—and we confess we can find no other meaning—that he has the right to give an exposition of the *original* prophecies, as he calls them, irrespective of John's inspired interpretations, it looks a little like placing himself upon a par with John, and claiming an equal ability to *unveil* the prophetic oracles. We however will receive any explanation the Professor may make to this, although upon his own rule we might take *this* passage to explain what he may subsequently say respecting it.

To take Isaiah to explain John, would be like taking the previous will of a deceased man to a Court of Probate, to explain and contradict, if need be, a codicil to his last will. But of all the *original* logic we have of late seen, we have found nothing to compare with the argument, that as the "title of John's prophecy, 'Apocalypse,' implies the *unveiling*" "the hidden sense of the prophetic oracles, previously uttered by his inspired predecessor," that therefore we are to take these previous oracles to unveil the hidden meaning of that which unveils them!! Now the fact that John *unveils* the hidden meaning of Isaiah, proves that Isaiah cannot be correctly understood without being thus unveiled. Consequently John must be regarded as the inspired interpreter of Isaiah; and John's positive statements must not be *contradicted* by any thing which may be only inferred from Isaiah. But it is asked, if John positively asserts "*there shall be no more death*" there, does not Isaiah as positively assert that the child will die an hundred years old? and can Isaiah contradict John?

We reply, that to make Isaiah assert there is death in the

new earth, will not only make him contradict John, but it will make him contradict himself. That inspired Seer, in the same prediction, had just affirmed that "Jerusalem should be created a rejoicing and her people a joy," and "that *the voice of weeping should be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying.*" It follows then that there can be there no sickness, pain, or death, as otherwise there must necessarily be weeping. But the prophet adds: "*There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days.*" If then there are no more thence any *infants*, there can be no births there, and consequently no deaths; and if there are to be there no old men, it must be a state of perennial youth. But the question may be asked, how it is there are no infants? will not the little infants come up in the resurrection, of whom it is said "they shall come again from the land of the enemy," "thy children shall come again to their own border"? But the prophet responds and gives the reason why there will be no children there: "For, the child shall die an hundred years old,"—i. e. as none are able to enter there but those who die and come up in the resurrection, and those who will be changed at Christ's coming—the child when it dies becomes *matured*, and comes up as vigorous in mind as if it died an hundred years old; "but the sinner, though an hundred years old, shall be accursed" when he leaves this state, and will never enter there. The very punctuation of this text, as adopted by Professor Bush, conveys this meaning,—the two clauses being separated by a colon(:) it denotes that the latter clause is exegetical of the former. This interpretation makes Isaiah consistent with himself; while the other interpretation makes him contradict both John and himself.

But, it is said they shall be blessed and their "offspring with them;" will there be generation in the new earth? No,—*There shall be no more thence an infant of days.* But the redeemed will walk there—not only parents, but all their pious offspring that had fallen asleep in Jesus. But Isaiah speaks of the animals there? So were there animals in Eden. And if there is to be the restitution of all things spoken, of by *all* the holy prophets, there may be animals in Eden restored. The apostle Paul in the 2d of Hebrews shows us that the 8th Psalm, where all sheep and oxen, &c. are spoken of as being put under the feet of man, has reference to "the world to come whereof we speak." And as the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but on account of man's trans-

gression, it is only an act of justice, in the regeneration, for them to be restored to the condition for which they as well as ourselves groan. But, inquires another, will there be eating and planting and building in the new earth? If such things were not inconsistent with Adam's condition in Eden, it may not be in Eden restored. God told him to dress the garden and keep it, and to eat freely of the fruit of all its trees, save one. Christ ate after his resurrection; the angels who visited Abraham partook of his hospitalities; and Israel in the wilderness "did eat angel's food." Their houses, however, will be only just such houses as such inhabitants will need in such a world: where there will be no call for bolts, or bars, or shelter from the winter's cold or summer's sun. And the labor must be without fatigue—not the earning of bread by the sweat of the brow, as under the curse,—but more like the "dressing of the garden and keeping of it." The prophecy of Isaiah is thus easily reconciled with that of John; and yet had not John given us a fuller and more explicit understanding of this future *age*, we might have been left to draw conclusions very similar to those arrived at by men who *reason backwards*, and take the earlier prophecy as a commentary and explanation of later ones!

But to avoid the necessity for any such conclusions, God has *unveiled* to us in the "Apocalypse," that he "shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." Also that then "he that is unjust will be unjust still, and he that is filthy will be filthy still." And, as if to remove any doubt as to the correctness of John's explanation of Isaiah, he adds:—"For I testify unto every man that heareth the *words* of the prophecy of *this book*, if any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall *take away* from the *words* of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." As the interest of each one in the holy city is presented as a motive to abide by the *words* of this prophecy, it is another evidence that it is the destined residence of *all* the saints.

The only reason why so many object to this description, as pertaining to the resurrection state of the saints, is because the idea has become prevalent that the heaven of the Chris-

tian is a purely etherealized condition, existing in almost empty space ; but where is the Scripture for such an abode ? it is not within the lids of the Bible. But if men would believe God when he assures us his eternal kingdom is to be "*under the whole heaven*," and is to be Eden restored, and that the meek will inherit the earth and dwell therein for ever ; these objections would not be offered. And any who would object to a residence in Eden restored, might have been dissatisfied in Eden, when God pronounced all things very good, had they been in Adam's stead.

THE PROPHECY OF EZEKIEL XL—XLVIII.

The next argument of Professor Bush respects the last chapters of Ezekiel, commencing with the 40th, which is the commencement of a new prophecy given in the twentieth year of the Babylonish captivity. His argument is, that the subject of this prediction is also identical with that just considered, the new creation of Isaiah and John. There would be some plausibility for this supposition, were it not for one consideration which has entirely escaped the Professor's notice, viz. that it is a *conditional* prophecy. Those prophecies which are *absolute* must be fulfilled in their appointed time and manner ; but there are another class of promises which depend upon certain conditions, which must be complied with, or the promises will be null and void. Thus in the 26th chapter of Leviticus, when God promised the Jews that he would give them rain in due season—that the land should yield her increase and the trees their fruit,—that their threshing should reach unto their vintage and their vintage unto their sowing time,—that they should eat their bread to the full and dwell in their land safely,—that they should lie down and none make them afraid,—that he would rid evil beasts out of their land, and the sword should not go through it,—that they should chase their enemies, who should fall before them by the sword, five of them chasing a hundred and an hundred putting ten thousand to flight,—that he would multiply them, make them fruitful, and establish his covenant with them,—that he would set his tabernacle among them, walk among them, and be their God, and they his people ;—it all depended upon the *condition* that they should worship no idols or graven image, or set up any image of stone or standing image to worship, that they should keep the sabbaths of the Lord, reverence his sanctuary, walk in his statutes, and keep his

commandments and do them. The Jews refused to comply with these conditions, and God bestowed upon them cursings instead of blessings.

So is this last prophecy of Ezekiel also *conditional*. The prophet was set upon a high mountain in the land of Israel, and shown what was "as the frame of a city." He was commanded to hear and see all that was shown him, that he might declare it to the house of Israel. Then he saw and measured the various gates, walls, porches, thresh-holds, chambers, posts, windows, courts, tables, hooks, steps, &c. &c., as described in the fortieth and forty-first chapters. Afterwards, xliii. 2—8, he beheld, and "the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east," and came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is towards the east," and "filled the house." "And he said unto me, Son of man, the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name, shall the house of Israel no more defile, neither they, nor their kings in their high places." The remaining chapters go on to speak of the law of the house, the ordinances of the altar, the duties of the priests and people, the division of the land, &c. which they were to observe if they should comply with the conditions, so that the Lord could fulfil this vision; and the consummation of which would be that "the name of the city from that day shall be THE LORD IS THERE. All this the prophet was commanded to offer, saying, "to the rebellious house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you for all your abominations;" and they were to receive it upon these conditions. —"Now, let them put away their whoredom, and the carcasses of their kings, far from me, and I will dwell in the midst of them for ever. Thou son of man, show the house to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities; and let them measure the pattern. *And IF they be ashamed of all that they have done*, show to them the form of the house and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof," "and all the laws thereof, and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof and do them," xliii. 6—11.

This seems to be a prophecy in reference to their restoration from Babylon, at the end of their seventy years' captivity, *if* they would comply with its *conditions*. But the Jews did not comply: they did not put away their gross sins and abom-

inations, and were not ashamed of their iniquities and all that they had done ; so that if Ezekiel showed them the form of the house, they did not build the temple after the pattern. And thus continuing in their sins, the glory of the Lord, THE HOLY SHEKINAH, never dwelt in the second temple as it did in the first ; and none of these promises were fulfilled to them, as they would have been had they complied with the conditions. Thus the prophecy, being a conditional prophecy, cannot have respect to a state identical with the absolute prophecies of Isaiah and John in the New Earth.

Being thus far agreed that the new creation of the prophet and of that of the revelator are identical, and to be upon the earth, we now approach the question respecting the nature of the events to usher in this glorious state.

THE REGENERATION OF THE EARTH BY FIRE.

Professor Bush is of the opinion that "the glorious *denouement* which we are taught to anticipate in the sequel of the world's destiny, is to be brought about by human agency," in connection with "extraordinary events," but with no "stupendous miracles" to break up the existing order of things. The most descriptive prophecy respecting the changes to precede this dispensation, is that in 2 Peter, iii. 1—14. Says Professor Bush :—

"The *letter* of the apostle's language is apparently so explicit in announcing the physical dissolution and passing away of 'these *respectable heavens*' and this material globe, *prior* to the introduction of the New Jerusalem, that it has scarcely entered into the thoughts of the readers or expositors of revelation, that any other construction could be proposed."—p. 51.

The difficulty Professor Bush finds in arriving at a different conclusion may be gathered from the following :—

"We do not profess to exhibit an interpretation devoid of all difficulty. We have not succeeded, in our own estimate, in so completely eliminating the subject from all embarrassment, as to feel that no serious objections can be urged against the view which on the whole we are constrained to adopt."—p. 52.

"The grand question that now awaits our solution is, whether the language of Peter, rightly construed, necessitates the conclusion, that the heavens and the earth are to undergo a physical destruction by volcanic or other fire, previous to the occurrence of that state which is denominated in the Apocalypse the New Jerusalem. If this be indeed the true and indubitable import of his words, then we must at once relinquish the position we have assumed above ; for such a catastrophe is fatally at war with the view advanced of the *gradual* ushering in and supervening of that blissful period upon the previously existing state of the church and the world. The two theories are utterly incompatible, and the one or the other must inevitably give way. With whatever impetus the present order of things

may be moving onward to such a grand consummation, it can never acquire a momentum sufficient to enable it to shoot the huge gulf made by the dropping out from under it of the solid globe itself. But let us look at the *ipsissima verba* of the apostle. We cite the passage in full.

2 Pet. iii. 1—14. 'This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you; in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance: that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Savior: knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.'

This, it must be admitted, is strong language, and taking the passage by itself, independent of its relations to any other portion of Scripture, we see not how any but the plain literal sense could easily be educed from it. The *prima facie* evidence is certainly in favor of the popular and accredited interpretation, and if we are led to seek any other, it is because we are forced to it *ex necessitate rei*, or by the stress of collateral considerations."—pp. 53, 54.

The Professor then proceeds to give his reasons for being *forced* to a different conclusion, and,

1.—He claims that the Bible is designed simply "to teach man his *duty*"—that its drift "*is moral*," and is not designed "to instruct men in *absolute verities*, either of Astronomy, Geology, Physiology or Chemistry"; but "speaks in accommodation to the then existing state of knowledge, or to the popular notions then entertained, without assuming to pronounce upon them as correct or incorrect." So that we should look for the fate of this earth, "rather in the Apocalypse of Newton, Laplace or Herschell, than in that of John."

The defect in this argument is, that instead of ascertaining

the design of the Author of the Bible from what is therein written, he has gone to work backwards to ascertain what is written, from what is assumed to be its Author's design. Now we admit the design of the Bible is not to instruct in scientific verities, and that language is used in accordance with popular notions—like the standing still of the Sun, its rising and setting, &c. But we deny that a positive declaration is anywhere made in the Scriptures, where *instruction* is being communicated, that is in *opposition* to the *absolute verities* of science. When the Bible speaks, its *design* is to tell the *truth*; and we may as well argue that Peter is not to be understood as speaking of a literal flood, as that he is not, of a literal fire. The argument of what it designs to teach would militate as much against the letter of the one, as of the other; and if the Bible can record an *absolute verity* respecting the destruction of the earth by water, it *may* thus teach respecting a deluge of fire. Because its design is to teach man his duty, it does not follow that it is limited to that.

2.—His second argument is that "John speaks as truly under the influence of inspiration as Peter, and as we read *his* discourses, they as imperatively enforce upon us the inference of the world's continuance, as do Peter's of its termination," and that John's new earth is after "the dissolution predicted by Peter"; so that the common construction "inevitably brings the apostle into *literal* conflict with other portions of the inspired volume."

The whole of this objection rests upon a departure from the letter of Scripture. Peter does not affirm that the earth will cease to continue; he says it will be *dissolved*, but, nevertheless, there will be a new earth; i. e. it will be regenerated. He says the old world perished by water; and yet it was not annihilated—so that if John does assert this "world's continuance," Peter does not conflict with him. But John, instead of asserting this world's continuance, independent of any change, expressly affirms that he "saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away." "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new." There is nothing in John to disprove that this change is to be its dissolution by fire: so that John and Peter agree. They both assert the passing away of the old heavens and earth, and the creating, or re-arranging of the new. But while John only states the fact, Peter states *how* it will be done. It is true that if we refuse to let John speak his own

words, he may contradict Peter ; but when they are both permitted to speak as they have spoken, there is no contradiction between the two.

3.—His third argument is that—

"Peter, it will be observed, after describing the melting of the elements and the passing away of the heavens and earth, immediately adds, 'Nevertheless we, *according to his promise*, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' Here is a distinct allusion to a special *promise* contained in some other part of the Scriptures, announcing a superlatively happy period to ensue *after* the precedent destruction described by the apostle. Where then is this promise, and how is it to be understood? A reference to Isaiah lxx. 17—25, at once discloses to us the prophetic intimation which the apostle had in mind." "For behold I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad, and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." &c.—p. 56.

He then argues that the prediction of Isaiah is descriptive of a state at variance with the idea of its previous destruction. But this argument we have already replied to. He then adds:

"But it is clear that the *literal statements* of each are directly inter-repugnant, and that the one or the other must receive a *spiritual* interpretation. Which shall it be? Shall we make Peter conform to Isaiah, or Isaiah to Peter? Shall we read Isaiah as predicting a *physical* change in the visible heavens and earth, or Peter as announcing a *spiritual* one?—for upon one horn or the other of the dilemma we are inextricably fixed. The point is one on which, for ourselves, we do not hesitate. The evidence is to our mind convincing, that whatever may have been the apostle's private personal views, the Holy Spirit, who spake by him, designed to set forth the same great moral change in the state of the world which is depicted in the earlier prediction of Isaiah. The apostles, for the most part, act the part of mere *expositors* of the *true sense* of the Old Testament writings, and the very title of the closing book of the sacred canon—'Apocalypse'—is doubtless adopted for the reason that it contains a *revelation*, or *development* of the *hidden purport* of the ancient prophets. It is much seldomer than is generally imagined, that we meet with any original and independant disclosures. The germs of all New Testament truths are to be found in the Old, and it is only by a deadly violence that one moiety of the great body of revelation is sundered from the other."—p. 59.

This is the great point upon which the whole question turns. We admit that Isaiah and Peter, if rightly understood, "must harmonize." But are "the literal statements of each" "directly inter-repugnant?" We cannot see that they are. Isaiah does not assert that there will be no physical change in this earth; and he expressly asserts that God will create new heavens and a new earth, and that the former shall not be remembered. How this creation is to be effected he does not inform us, and therefore, when Peter affirms that it is to be by

the melting of the elements, it can be no contradiction of Isaiah ; for he still assures us that there is to be a new heaven and a new earth according to Isaiah's promise. Now if we are willing to admit that the new earth will be the abode of the risen saints, that it will be Eden restored, and that man will have recovered what Adam lost by the "curse," it will harmonize with Isaiah's description of the new earth, and will not be inconsistent with Peter's description of the conflagration unto which the earth is reserved. But when we deny the letter of all those texts which bring to view the resurrection and the restitution of all things, and then on account of such denial are obliged to give an interpretation to Isaiah which makes him conflict with Peter, shall it be received as an evidence that the letter of Peter is to be departed from, to make it harmonize with such interpretations, when there would be no want of harmony in understanding *all* those Scriptures literally? Certainly not. But Professor Bush's objection to the letter of Peter is based upon a previous rejection of the letter of other Scriptures, so that he is necessitated to reject the letter of Isaiah also, to harmonize his theory. But the discrepancy is not between Isaiah and Peter, but between Peter and Professor Bush.

But says Professor Bush:—"The apostles, for the most part, act the part of mere *expositors* of the *true sense* of the Old Testament writings." If, then, they are the *expositors* of the earlier predictions, being inspired, they are inspired expositors. An expositor is one who explains that which is obscure or hidden; and if the New Testament writers "*develop*" the "*hidden purport*" of the Old, does it not follow that we should be unable to perceive, or, should mistake respecting their "*hidden purport*" without these inspired expositions? And if we have these inspired expositions, why should we not receive them as such, especially, as Professor Bush admits, they give "*the true sense* of the Old Testament writings"? It would certainly seem that Professor Bush's own argument, in admitting they are "*expositors*," and give "*the true sense*," makes against his own position, and gives him no excuse for rejecting Peter's explanation.

We have thus endeavored to show how Peter's regeneration of the earth by fire harmonizes with the obvious tenor of Isaiah and the Apocalypse ; and as Professor Bush admits that if this can be shown on clear and satisfactory grounds, he will at once relinquish his stand against the *literal* mode of inter-

pretation, we hope he may be induced so to do. We have not the vanity to suppose that any thing we might advance would effect so mighty a revolution in his mind. But we trust the Professor will see that, by his own admissions, he has at best only probable evidence with which to oppose the positive declarations of the word of God; and also that this probable evidence is less sustained by reason and philosophy, than it is by imaginary difficulties, which can militate nothing against the omnipotence of Him who made the sea and dry land. We think it cannot be denied that Peter and John have given "*the true sense*" of the 65th of Isaiah, in their inspired "*expositions*" of that portion of Scripture. And if the conflagration of Peter is a literal melting of the earth,—and from the "*plain narrative* announcement of the event, and its comparison with the deluge," we see not how this conclusion can be avoided—it must follow, that the resurrection and second coming of Christ will be of the same literal nature. Sustained as all these questions are by proofs of the most positive and convincing kind, we regard them as truths as immutable as the purposes of God can make them, as truths which all the wisdom of this world can never gainsay or resist; but which will shortly be fulfilled in all their grandeur. May God prepare us for the ushering in of that glorious day, that we may attain unto the resurrection of the just, be kings and priests for ever in the kingdom of God, and reign with Christ on the earth. May "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN," be speedily "given to the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an EVERLASTING kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him:"—when "the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom *for ever, even for ever and ever.*"

THE REVIEW.

Boston, April, 1845.

THIS NO. OF THE SHIELD.

THOSE of our readers who are fond of a variety may be somewhat disappointed with this number of the Shield, as it is entirely devoted to the consideration of the views of Professor Bush. Those, however, who consider the importance of these questions at the present moment, will not regret that so much space is occupied in their discussion. Besides, were it not for the purpose of presenting a review of this whole subject, the present number would not thus early have been issued.

The review of Professor Bush's work on the Resurrection was commenced with reference to its publication in the Advent Herald, as intimated in the last number of the Shield. But we soon found that we could not do justice to this question if restricted to so narrow limits. And as we wished to present fairly the full force of all the Professor's arguments, with a candid reply to the same, we have concluded to issue them in the present form. How successful we have been in meeting and setting aside the force of his reasoning, we leave to the decision of others.

We have regarded the appearance of no work, that has of late been published, with more interest, than we have the work under review. We regard it as the exponent of the views of a large, and an increasing body of communicants in the churches. And we conceive that it will be productive of a great change in the minds of many who shall give it a perusal. His argument, showing the identity of the new creation of Isaiah the new earth of Peter and the New Jerusalem of John, we regard as invulnerable. And all who admit its force must go with him in his views of the resurrection and end of the world, or they must admit the correctness of the principles of interpretation for which we contend. But we venture to predict that the great mass of the spiritualists who admit the resurrection of the body, will content themselves with disproving his argument from reason, and will not venture to approach that part of his argument that has reference to the identity of those predictions. All we have noticed of that class who have thus far adverted to, or reviewed the work, have avoided the dilemma in which they would thus be placed, by leaving that part of the book untouched. But that is very unfair; for if a single

argument there advanced is at variance with any theory, let it be fairly met, and either be disposed of, or its validity admitted.

We entertain the greatest respect for the gentlemanly and intellectual qualities of Professor Bush ; and although the perusal of his work has not inspired us with any very exalted ideas of his "profound reverence for the Sacred Oracles," i. e., for the *letter of the text* ; yet it would be doing him injustice to intimate that he is actuated by other motives than a sincere desire to arrive at the *truth* of the various questions herein discussed. If, therefore, there may have escaped us any expressions which may be deemed disrespectful to him, we can assure him that they are not so designed. We have ever regarded Professor Bush as one of our most honest, honorable, and candid opponents. He has never resorted to any unfair, or unmanly course for the purpose of opposing the doctrine of the Advent. But while he has ever expressed himself as directly antipodal to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures, he has always met these questions like one who was willing to receive whatever might be shown to be the truth, feeling, if his arguments could be shown to be fallacious, no desire to resort to personal invective in their defence. We have the fullest confidence in the unsoundness of his reasoning, and we hope that he may yet be induced to take his stand upon the literal—the only safe and sure foundation of prophetic interpretation. In the mean time we are anxious that some of the spiritualists should attempt to meet his argument on the new creation : while they fail to come up to that, they neither do justice to their own cause, or to Professor Bush.

NOTICES.

THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE SHIELD.

THIS No. completes the first Volume of the Shield which was commenced about one year since. As the second No. was so long delayed, we have been enabled to give but three Nos. for this Volume. It will, however, make a very good sized work, of nearly 450 pages. If time shall continue, the first No. of another Volume may be expected in due time. There are several important topics, with the presentation of which we hope to enrich its pages.

THE TITLE-PAGE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS

As those who obtain the three Nos. of this Volume, might wish to bind them, we have thought best to append to this a title-page, and table of contents for reference. A title-page was appended to the first No., but its date was not correct for the title-page to the Volume : and the table of contents on the back of that title-page, was also necessarily imperfect.—Those therefore who may wish for a perfect Volume will thus be enabled to supply those deficiencies.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE WORLD'S CONVERSION DEMONSTRATED.

As the article commenced in the last No. of the Shield, showing the impossibility of the world's conversion, from the prophetic destiny, modern history, present attitude, resources and intentions of Popery, is not continued in this No., our readers may expect a word in explanation. As it was thought proper to devote the whole of this No. to the important works of Professor Bush, no other article of any considerable length could be admitted. Should we be permitted to commence another Volume, the unfinished article will doubtless be completed.

We have a supply of No. 2 of the Shield on hand, with which we can furnish those who may wish for the last No. The edition of the first No. is exhausted.

ERRATA.—We find, on a critical examination of the articles contained in this work, that there are several typographical errors. Some of them are not very important, while others materially affect the sense, which are as follows :—

Page 9, (in the note) for "Kirby," read *Faber*.

" 20, 13th line from the bottom, the clause, "by a new title, viz. Revelation," the last word should read in the plural, "Revelations."

" 36, 11th line from top, for "*ignus fatui*," read *ignes fatui*.

" 38, 13th " " " for "*was invested*," read, *are invested*.

" " 4th " " bottom, for a *happy* delusion, read *an unhappy* delusion.

" 112, 17th " " top, for "*secures*," read *deserves*.

" 114, 13th " " " for "*anti-type*," read, *great type*.

" 115, 20th, and also in the 12th line from bottom, for "*representation*," read *representative*.

" 189, 4th line from bottom, for "*Conscience*," read *Convenience*.

" 238, 18th line from top, for "*exactly*," read *nearly*.

" 385, 19th " " " for "*did not to inform*," read *did not inform*.

" 432, 12th " " top for "*and of that of the revelator*," read, *and that of the revelator*.

THE ADVENT SHIELD AND REVIEW.



THIS work will be continued as the cause we advocate shall demand it. Notice will be duly given in our papers when another number will be issued.



AGENCIES.

The SHIELD may be obtained at 14 Devonshire Street Boston, 9 Spruce Street, New York, by addressing J. V. HIMES; 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia, Pa. J. Litch; Rochester, New York, 17 Arcade, J. Marsh.

The SHIELD will be sent, by *Mail*, to any part of the United States, when ordered. To Postmasters, or others who remit ONE DOLLAR, free of expense; we will send THREE copies. Single copies at 37½ cents.



SECOND ADVENT PUBLICATIONS,

Of every description, can be procured either at 14 Devonshire-street, Boston; 9 Spruce-st, New York, or 3 1-2 South Seventh St. Philadelphia. J. V. HIMES.



POSTAGE.—Seven Sheets—under 100 miles, 10 1-2 cts.—over 100 miles, 17 1-2 cts.



2192
DOW & JACKSON'S POWER PRESS, 14 DEVONSHIRE ST. BOSTON